AA 000 702 530 7
UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/tractxchistorica00good

With the Author's
respects
31 Charterhouse Sq

TRACT XC.

HISTORICALLY REFUTED;

OR,

A REPLY

TO A WORK BY

THE REV. F. OAKELEY,

ENTITLED,

"THE SUBJECT OF TRACT XC. HISTORICALLY EXAMINED."

BY

WILLIAM GOODE, M.A. F.S.A.,

RECTOR OF ST. ANTHOLIN, LONDON.

"Cum Dominus noster Ecclesiæ suæ Doctores pastoresque dederit, qui docendi munus, alii aliis, tanquam in cursu lampada, usque ad extremum seculorum finem traderent; quid nobis optabilius, quid, sive ad laudem, sive ad felicitatem, amplius contingere potuit, quàm ut huic mandato exsequendo pro officii nostri ratione inservire daretur? Hoc præcipuè tempore, quo, licèt Ecclesia Nostra non contemnendas jactare possit Doctorum aliorumque egregiorum virorum copias, qui scriptis eam præclarissimis defendunt, ac moribus etiam probatissimis ornant, multo tamen adhuc majores desiderare videtur. Hinc enim Pontificii, *veteres Ecclesiæ Reformatæ hostes*, omnibus, quibus possunt, modis eam oppugnant; nunc aperto Marte decernere parant; victi atque fatigati, *dolis atque insidiis, quæ plerumque melius illis cessere*, quid assequi valeant, experiuntur; *amicitias simulant, in nostra transiisse castra videri volunt;* nil intentatum relinquunt, quo imprudentiores e nostris decipi sperant atque opprimi posse. Inde alii," &c.

ABP. POTTER. Works, iii. 345.

LONDON:

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

1845.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY G. J. PALMER, SAVOY-STREET, STRAND.

CONTENTS.

Introductory remarks - - - - - -	*Page* 1—5
Leading view of Tract XC. and Mr. Oakeley's defence of it -	5, 6
Preliminary objections supposed by Mr. Oakeley replied to -	6—10
Arrangement of argument adopted by Mr. Oakeley and here followed . - - - - - - -	10
I. The account given by Mr. Oakeley of the historical facts connected with the composition and promulgation of the Thirty-nine Articles; with the answer to it - - - - - -	10—105
Mr. Oakeley's account &c. - - - - -	10—17
General remarks on it - - - - -	17—19
Case of Articles of Edward VI. as to subscription, meaning, and object - - - - - - -	19—24
These Articles one main ground of Cranmer's condemnation, and pronouncedby the University of Oxford to be "heretical, impious and execrable" - - - - -	24—27
Under Q. Elizabeth, first step towards Reformation to prohibit preaching, and why - - - - - -	27—29
Public discussion between Romanists and Protestants -	29
Introduction of Prayer-book, and its consequences -	29—33
Romish opinions of that Book, and statements as to its effects - - - - - - - -	33—42
The conduct of our Reformers with respect to altars and images in churches, showing the principle on which they went - - - - - - - -	43—46
Queen Elizabeth's opposition to Popery firm and uncompromising - - - - - - - -	46—48
General proceedings of Archbishop Parker and the Commissioners as to Popery - - - - -	48, 49
Case of Jewell's Apology, and its testimony - - -	49—54
Declaration of certain principal Articles of Religion in 1560 -	54—56
Orders of 1560 as to preaching - - - -	57
Articles of 1562 not required to be subscribed, at first, by the clergy generally, but only by the members of Convocation; and the effect of this - - - - - -	57—59

611748

RESERVE

Page

Nature and extent of toleration granted to the Romanists at that time - - - - - - - - 59—65
Period of application of term "recusant" - - - 66
Whether any Romanists were members of the Convocation of 1562 - - - - - - - - 67, 68
Argument derived from subscription of the members of that Convocation answered - - - - - 69—71
Reference to Strype's Grindal respecting subscription incorrect 71
Proceedings of Bishops and Lower House of Convocation respecting the Articles previous to their being settled - 72, 73
In what respects the Articles of 1562 differ from those of 1552 - - - - - - - - 73—77
Comparative chronology of the Articles and the Decrees of the Council of Trent - - - - - - 77
The *object* for which the Articles were put forth, to produce unity of doctrine - - - - - 77, 78
This a leading object with our Reformers - - - 78—81
This the intention of the subscription required by the Act of 1571 - - - - - - - - 81
Testimony of Nowell's Catechism, agreed upon in Convocation of 1562 - - - - - - - - 81, 82
Publication of a work against the Decrees of the Council of Trent, apparently under the auspices of Parker - - 83
Subscription to the Articles required as a test against Romanism - - - - - - - 84
Petition to the Queen in 1566 *by Archbishop Parker and the bishops, in which it is expressly stated, that the errors of the Romanists are "condemned by the Articles"* - - 84—86
Convocation of 1571 - - - - - 86
Meaning of Act of 1571 - - - - - 87, 88
Articles always considered by our divines as a test against the errors of the Church of Rome. Proofs from Rogers, Bennet, Beveridge, Burnet, Tomline, Pearson, Waterland, Conybeare, and Potter - - - - - - 88—93
The same view almost universally taken by the Romanists. Proofs from Hawardine, Smith, Broughton, and Roberti - 93—96
Testimony of the Book of Homilies - - - 97—100
How far subscription to the 35th Article involves subscription to the Book of Homilies - - - - - 100—105

II. Ecclesiastical decisions on the subject of Roman doctrine distinct from the Articles - - - - - - - 105—119
(1) Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions and Articles of Visitation 106
(2) Jewell's Apology - - - - - - 106
(3) Nowell's Catechism - - - - - - 106
(4) Public form of prayer in 1563 - - - - - 106
(5) Do. thanksgiving in 1594 - - - - 106, 7
(6) Canons of 1640 - - - - - - - 107—9

Page

(7) Rubric re-inserted in Prayer Book at the revision in 1661 109—13
Dean Aldrich's statement of the doctrine of our Church as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist - 114—18
(8) Declaration in Act of 25 Car. II. c. 2. - - - 118
(9) Do. 30 Car. II. c. 1. (st. 2.) - - 118, 19

III. Similar attempts in former times in this country to that under review - - - - - - - - 119—31
Attempt of Christopher Davenport, or, Franciscus a Sancta Clara - - - - - - - 120, 21
Attempt of Thomas Dean - - - - - 121—28
Work entitled, "Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome," published in 1687 - - 129
Dr. Du Pin's Commonitorium - - - - 129—31

IV. Instances adduced by Mr. Oakeley of divines of our Church who (he says) maintained similar views to those contended for by Mr. Newman and himself - - - - - 131—51
Case of Bishop Forbes - - - - - 131—33
——— Bishop Andrews - - - - - 133—35
——— Bishop Mountague - - - - - 135—45
——— H. Thorndike - - - - - 145—51

V. Testimonies of individuals as to the relative character of the doctrine of the Church of England and that of the Church of Rome - - - - - - - 151—90
Romish testimonies
Lord Mountague, Sir F. Englefield, Harding, Rastell, &c. - 151, 2
Pope Pius V. - - - - - - 152, 3
Church of England testimonies
Of the first three Protestant sovereigns after the accession of Queen Elizabeth
Queen Elizabeth - - - - - 153, 4
King James I. - - - - - 154, 5
King Charles I. - - - - - 156, 7
Of the Archbishops of Canterbury since the accession of Queen Elizabeth
Archbishop Parker - - - - - 158, 9
——— Grindal - - - - - 159, 60
——— Whitgift - - - - - 160, 1
——— Bancroft - - - - - 161—3
——— Abbot - - - - - 163
——— Laud - - - - - 164, 5
Of Juxon and Sheldon scarcely any remains - 165
Archbishop Sancroft - - - - - 165, 6
——— Tillotson - - - - - 166—71

Page

Archbishop Tenison - - - - - 171—3
——————— Wake - - - - - 173, 4
——————— Potter - - - - - 174, 5
Of Herring and Hutton scarcely any remains - 175
Archbishop Secker - - - - - 175, 6
Of Cornwallis, Moore, and Sutton, scarcely any remains - - - - - - 177
The Irish Church - - - - - - 177
Various divines of our Church:
Bishop Bridges - - - - - 178
Bishop Bilson - - - - - 178, 9
Bishop Lancelot Andrews - - - - 179, 80
Dean Field - - - - - - 180
Dr. Thomas Jackson - - - - - 180, 1
Dr. Peter Heylin - - - - - 181
Dr. Henry Hammond - - - - 182, 3
Bishop Morley - - - - - 183—5
Bishop Jeremy Taylor - - - - 185, 6
Bishop Patrick - - - - - 187
Bishop Stillingfleet - - - - - 187, 8
Archdeacon Daubeny - - - - 188, 9
Concluding remarks - - - - - - 190, 1

A REPLY, &c.

HOWEVER groundless a religious notion or theory may be, yet when it has obtained a certain degree of currency, and found its way into many minds, it becomes proportionably a matter of serious concernment to all who have at heart the interests of their fellow-creatures. It is useless to hope that any errors will fall by the weight of their own absurdity, or that propositions of the most untenable, I might say, unreasonable kind, when once affirmed, will not meet with minds prepared to receive them. It is not always, then, from the plausibility of an error, or the strength of the arguments with which it is supported, that a necessity arises for its being encountered. And, while I should much regret being betrayed into the use of any uncourteous language in replying to the works to which the following pages are intended as an answer, I feel almost constrained to preface what I have to say with this remark. The position maintained by Mr. Newman, Mr. Oakeley and others respecting the thirty-nine Articles, is to my mind so utterly and manifestly untenable and unreasonable, that an argument for the purpose of opposing it seems almost like one for proving that two and two do not make five. Moreover the arguments, historical deductions, extracts, and references given in proof of their position are often so startlingly inaccurate as to leave one at a loss to know how they found their way into the productions of men whom we believe incapable of voluntarily misleading the reader. I will venture to hope that Mr. Oakeley himself will feel that he has cause for

regret in this respect. The Tractarian system, indeed, to say nothing of its theological aspect, may be considered a sort of literary phenomenon, a comet, in the world of ecclesiastical literature, of undefinable eccentricity of orbit and path altogether undiscoverable.

It is, however, beyond question that many minds, warped insensibly towards Roman doctrine by Tractarian teaching, and then finding, like their leaders, that they must either quit the church of their fathers or discover some mode of reconciling their new views with the authoritative Formularies of that church, have adopted the ingenious reasonings by which the Tractarian system has been defended as consistent with the teaching of our church. Men whose minds are in the state to which we have alluded, are exposed to the influence of a powerful temptation to seek a way of escape from the difficulties with which they are surrounded, in ingenious glosses upon words and phrases, and happy applications of a few historical facts and isolated sentences of former writers (which may be found for anything), calculated, as they hope, to show, that the views they entertain are reconcileable with the engagements they have entered into, and the avowed violation of which would entail upon them consequences for which they are hardly prepared. To a man even of ordinary mental power, when placed in such a position, the task of inventing suitable interpretations is by no means a difficult one. And as far as regards the *moral* part of the question, great allowances must be made for the circumstances of the case. But the example is not the less dangerous. And those who take such a course must not be offended if others speak plainly when offering a word of warning against the delusion.

It is painful to contemplate the fact, that during the last ten years, principally under the tuition of one who, beginning with one of the worst principles of the Jesuits, has gradually found his way into all the interminable mazes of Romish sophistry, a new school has risen up among us; which, in the avowed attempt to unprotestantize our church, has rendered nugatory all the safeguards she had erected against the inroads of Popish

error, by explaining away her tests so as to make them mean anything or nothing as might best answer their purpose. Sentiments and statements, absolutely unprecedented in the whole history of our reformed church, have been put forth with equal confidence as if they were indisputable truths. Matters which have been ruled points in it during the whole period of its existence, as for instance its anti-Romish character, have been brought into question, and determined contrary to the testimony of every writer of its communion. And the truth has been so mystified by the ingenious sophistry by which doctrinal statements have been glossed, historical facts represented, and passages from our old divines applied, that many of the disciples of the new school are as little able clearly to see the true state of the case, as men in a labyrinth to find the right path.

There is much in the movement so foreign to the character of the English mind, that it is impossible not to hope, that if such a state of things be not a national judgment for sin, the delusion may be, in the case of the majority of its victims, only a temporary one. But the eagerness and credulity with which views and statements which a very little research would have disproved, and the arguments and sophisms employed for the defence of error, have been received, have been almost beyond belief. No doubt, this may be partly accounted for by the fact, that the great majority have neither time nor inclination to prosecute those researches which would enable them to test the representations thus made; and therefore when from any cause, such as a favourable predisposition of mind, a love of novelty, a concurrence of external causes, there exists a feeling in favour of the views advocated, in such cases the most flimsy and untenable arguments are sufficient to produce conviction. On no other ground is it possible to account for the temporary success that has attended the writings of the Tractarians. And hence it may reasonably be hoped, that when the true state of the case becomes more fully known, many who had been inclined to look upon the movement with favour, will recoil with feelings of no slight aversion from the views which had been thus pressed upon them.

These remarks, whatever may be thought of them by a superficial and prejudiced reader, will be found, by any impartial examiner into the merits of the case, to be strictly borne out by the facts. The following pages will alone, I trust, afford a tolerably decisive proof of their truth. The work to which they undertake to reply is one of the most elaborate productions of the party to which the writer belongs, in defence of the position that the thirty-nine articles may be signed by one who holds "all Roman doctrine." (p. xiii.) It was first published nearly four years ago, but has lately reappeared in a "second edition revised," with the modest remark, that, as it has had no regular answer, its author "feels it no sort of presumption to suppose, that the statements on which it [i. e. its chief position] rests, have not been disputed because they are in reality indisputable." (p. xi.)

For my own part, I can only say that until events very recently called my attention to it, and I was led to fear that its statements had misled many minds, I had only glanced hastily over its pages, and finding upon the face of it various mistakes, and propositions that seemed to me obviously untenable, I had at once laid it aside. Now however that it seems to have had a favourable reception in many quarters, and that Mr. Oakeley expresses a desire to see an answer, and intimates that the great question for which he wishes to obtain an authoritative decision will be left undetermined by the legal judgment on his case, it appears desirable to place, both before him and the public, evidence which may enable them to pass a judgment for themselves. It is to be regretted, indeed, that his pamphlet did not long ago receive an answer; and I cannot deny that both the Church and the Tractarians have reason to complain of the silence observed, during the recent controversy, as far as concerns works of learning or enduring character, by those who have been entrusted, *professedly for such purposes*, with the means and opportunities to defend the truth. But the fact is, that *(speaking generally)* for the last hundred years and more, both in the Universities and the Church, ecclesiastical learning

has been not only neglected, but *practically* discountenanced, and heathen and secular literature (important in its place) substituted for it; and the Church is now reaping the legitimate and necessary fruits of such a state of things. How different the conduct of the Romanists in this respect!

From this work, and the confidence with which it is put forth, the reader may see how far the leading men of the party are trustworthy guides. It must be remembered that this work was lying by its author for three years before its second publication, and yet at the end of that time it is re-issued, as remarkable a collection of misstatements and mistakes as could easily be crowded together within the same space. I doubt whether there is one statement, of any importance to the main argument, from the beginning to the end, which will bear examination. And I would earnestly implore those of the party who are really desirous of knowing the truth, to pause before they commit themselves to the guidance of such leaders.

"The main object proposed" in the pamphlet, we are told, "is that of defending on *historical* grounds alone the subscription of those clergymen of our church, or members of the university (be they more or fewer), who, in subscribing, reserve to themselves the power of holding all Roman Catholic doctrine, as distinct, on the one hand, from popular perversions of it, and, on the other, from the question of the Papal jurisdiction." (Adv. p. viii.)

It is contended, that "the sense in which the Articles were propounded was not a Catholic, nor a Protestant, but a vague indecisive and therefore comprehensive sense; that the Reformers themselves were without any precise doctrinal views of their own upon the points in controversy; that they were consequently the victims, alternately, of extreme Catholic and extreme Protestant influences; that, so far as they had any doctrinal sympathies of their own, they were Protestant rather than Catholic, but that the necessities of their position, as having to provide for the religious pacification of a country, partly Catholic, partly Protestant, obliged them to a course (so far as doctrines at issue between the contending parties were concerned)

of the strictest neutrality; and that the mode by which they sought to carry out this principle of neutrality, was that of couching their Formulary in language at once sufficiently Protestant in tone to satisfy the Reformers abroad, and sufficiently vague in expression to include the Catholics at home." (Ib. p. ix.)

This statement is, as the author intimates in a note, merely a reiteration of what Tract 90 declared more briefly in the following words,—" The Protestant confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics, and now Catholics will not be excluded." (p. 83.)

A more painful misstatement, and one, I will add, more obviously untrue and absurd to any one who is acquainted with the documents and history of that period, could not be conceived.

The argument, it is said, " being purely historical, depends for its force entirely upon the truth of the alleged facts;" it depends " simply on matters of fact." (Ib. p. x.) Without admitting this to be the case, then, (for we hold that the Articles themselves sufficiently refute such a statement) we will in the following pages direct our attention to those " matters of fact."

Before however we proceed further, we will notice Mr. Oakeley's replies to two preliminary objections he supposes to be made to his statement.

The first is, that it is a " paradoxical" one. " It is," he says, " I am well aware, a novel (or rather a revived*), and certainly paradoxical statement; though not more so, I must think, than any attempt to vindicate for the great majority of the articles any other than a Protestant interpretation. I confess myself utterly unable to appreciate the line of those (although it numbers a Roman Catholic, i. e. Sancta Clara, among its supporters†), who can see a Catholic meaning stamped upon the surface of the 39 Articles (I am not of course

* This is a mistake, as far as writers of our own church are concerned.

† This again is a mistake; Sancta Clara's words in more than one place show his sense of the difficulty of the task he undertook.

referring to the first five). On the contrary, to myself, they appear *in many serious instances so strikingly uncatholic in sound*, that the *only* reflection upon which I can fall back with any comfort, is that suggested in the 8th chapter of the "Ideal of a Christian Church," viz. that the difficulties which the Prayer-book presents to those who deny, for instance, the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, or accept that of Justification, in the Lutheran sense, are *unquestionably greater* than those which any, even the most Protestantly-worded, of the Articles offer to such as desire to interpret them in harmony with the formal decisions of the Catholic Church; and accordingly, that if the authorities of the University and of the Church of England allow what are called 'evangelicals' to assent to the Prayer-book in their sense, those like myself are *a fortiori* at liberty to subscribe the Articles in ours. And again I am relieved by considering, with the author of the aforesaid work, that the chief difficulties which occur to myself and others in the matter of subscription, do not arise so much from the Articles which touch upon characteristically Roman opinions or practices, as from those which (like the 11th, 12th, and especially the 13th), *appear to contravene the most elementary truths of all religion*, and (what is yet more to the present purpose) doctrines, upon which all ordinary 'churchmen' whatsoever are supposed to agree." (pp. xi, xii.)

The reader is earnestly entreated to reflect upon this extraordinary passage. It appears from it that the Articles seem to Mr. Oakeley "in many serious instances so strikingly uncatholic in sound," that his *only* comfort in subscribing them is, that the Church and the University allow "evangelicals" to assent to the Prayer-book, who hold views which *appear to him* to make the Prayer-book present greater "difficulties" (as he dexterously words it) to them, than the Articles do to him. Has Mr. Oakeley really forgotten that what the Church or University or "evangelicals" or any body else may do is utterly irrelevant to the question, as it regards his own case; and that his subscription to the Articles is a matter of conscience between himself and his God?

Still further, he is additionally "relieved," he tells us, by considering that the Articles which he has the greatest difficulty about, "appear to contravene the most elementary truths of all religion," and doctrines which all those who *in his view* are "churchmen" are supposed to receive. Astounding source of consolation! These Articles, in the sense in which they would be understood by a plain ordinary reader, are to his mind so atrociously bad as to convey to him the consoling reflection, that there must be some esoteric meaning in them altogether opposed to that which appears upon the surface of them. Their very opposition (to all appearance) to the truth, gives him comfort, and he signs them in the happy confidence that they are too bad to be meant to be understood in the sense which the words seem to ordinary readers to convey. The same view will of course equally solve the difficulties of Arians or Socinians, or any other heretics, who may wish to remain in our Church, and be staggered with any of the Articles.

The other preliminary objection to his view of the matter, to which he replies, is, that it is an unprecedented one.

He says,—"Among other objections which have been made to No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times, it is said to propound a view of the thirty-nine Articles, which is unprecedented in the Church of England. The present collection of extracts is brought forward for the purpose of showing that such is not the case." (p. 19). And again; "Is it not, that they [i. e. his opponents] are seeking to oppose, as at variance with the doctrine of the Church of which they are members, views, concerning which it is, at all events, a doubtful question, whether they have not in past ages been assumed or even pronounced compatible with that doctrine?" (p. 24.) "If the value of the evidence about to be produced be not greatly overrated, it would certainly tend to the conclusion, that not they are introducing 'a new era,' in the Church of England, who endeavour to reconcile certain doctrines, however now, as of old, unpopular, with the language of the Articles, but rather they, who speak of subjecting to penalties, or placing under incapacities, the persons who are but claiming liberty to *hold* what English

divines of former times claimed, and were allowed, liberty to *teach*. This rather than the other would seem, if it may be said with all respect, to be the line of 'innovation.'" (p. 24.)

Now we utterly deny, that any divine of the Church of England can be found, who publicly maintained without censure the view, that all Roman doctrine might be held consistently with subscription to the Articles and Liturgy of that Church. And we challenge Mr. Oakeley, or any one else, to point out such a case in the whole annals of our Reformed Church. We affirm therefore that the present case is one wholly unprecedented. And we shall show in the following pages that Mr. Oakeley's attempts to make out anything like the shadow of a precedent for it are utterly fruitless.

The question between him and his opponents is not, whether or not there may be found in the writings of some divines of the Church of England statements on certain points more consistent with the doctrine of the Church of Rome than with that of the Church of England, and statements which have passed without any recorded authoritative censure. It is readily granted, that such passages may be found, and numerous are the reasons which might be assigned for their having been passed over without authoritative censure. But what do they prove? Absolutely nothing. Is it any justification of a man who puts forth erroneous doctrines, that one or two divines of our church, and those perhaps in some respects eminent ones, can be pointed out, who have said the same, and from one circumstance or another have escaped public censure? If so, various heresies might claim a place in our Church.

If, indeed, Mr. Oakeley could show that a *great number* of the divines of our church, at *different periods* of her history, had clearly maintained *without contradiction or censure* any particular doctrine of the Church of Rome, it might afford a presumption in favour of such a doctrine being reconcileable with the Articles and Liturgy of our Church. But even this would not carry him beyond the particular doctrines so supported. The conclusion would not follow that he might hold "all Roman doctrine," because certain Romish doctrines had been maintained by divines of our church.

But the fact is, that as it respects all the most offensive errors of the Church of Rome, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the invocation of saints, purgatory, and such like, nothing of the kind can be shown. Not only is their condemnation by the authoritative formularies of our church distinct and decisive, and the testimony of our divines against them overwhelming, both as it respects numbers and learning, but the testimonies which can be supposed to favour any of them are such as from their extreme paucity, or the known singularity of the opinions of their authors, or from some similar cause, rather indicate opposition to the views of our church, than agreement with them; so far are they from supporting Mr. Oakeley's case.

Mr. Oakeley's argument may be divided into four parts,—He considers

I. The facts connected with the composition and promulgation of the thirty-nine Articles.

II. Any subsequent decisions of the Church.

III. The attempts that have been made similar, as he considers, to his own.

IV. What may be alleged from the writings of individual divines in his favour.

We shall follow the same order, and conclude with a *fifth* division, containing authorities from the writings of our most eminent divines against the view here opposed.

I. The account given by Mr. Oakeley of the historical facts connected with the composition and promulgation of the thirty-nine Articles is as follows;—

After remarking that "history gives *no countenance whatever* to the opinion that the Articles were drawn up *with the view of excluding Roman Catholics*," he thus proceeds,—"With respect to the original Articles of 1552, it seems doubtful, whether they were ever enforced; if at all, it was but in few instances.* After the revision of 1562, they *were* enforced;

* Mr. Oakeley's note here is—"'He (Cranmer) laboured to have the clergy

but, as it appears, against *non-conformists* and not Roman Catholics. The question with Rome was then, as in after times, regarded in a merely political point of view.

" ' Against Papists (says Fuller, who certainly cannot be suspected of any Romanistic bias) it was exacted [enacted] that to write, print, &c., *that the Queen was a heretic*, &c., should be adjudged *treason*. *Against non-conformists*, it was provided that every Priest or Minister should, before the nativity of Christ next following, declare his assent, and subscribe, to all the Articles of Religion agreed on in the Convocation of 1562, under pain of deprivation.' (Fuller p. 98. Eliz.)

" And accordingly it appears that Roman Catholics continued in the communion, and even in the ministry, of the Church of England, for several years after the first promulgation of the Articles.

" ' Hitherto' (i. e. till A. D. 1570) ' Papists generally without regret repaired to the places of divine service, and were present at our prayers, sermons, and sacraments. . . . . In which sense, one may say, that the whole land was of one language and one speech. . . . . Hitherto the English Papists slept in a whole skin, and so might have continued, had they not wilfully torn it themselves.'*

" It further appears, that many members of the Lower House of Convocation, who were Roman Catholics, subscribed the Articles upon the revision in 1562.†

" The term ' Recusant,' by which the Roman Catholics of this country were formerly designated, at once denotes the ground,

subscribe them ; but against their will he compelled none.' Strype's Cranmer, p. 272. cf. Bp. Short's Hist. of the Church of England, § 484."

* Mr. Oakeley's note here is—" Fuller, p. 98. Eliz. See also Strype's Grindal, p. 98. ' Of the subscribers (to Queen Eliz. injunctions for conformity) . . . . . there were many, who had said mass in Queen Mary's time, and such as would not change their custom of old Pater Noster.' Vide Short's Hist. of the Church of England, § 437."

† Mr. Oakeley's note here is,—" Strype (Ann. of Ref. c. xxviii.) gives their names : and, among them, we find that of the celebrated John Bridgwater, (called in Latin, Aquapontanus) who, in 1582, published the Treatise called, ' Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ in Anglia adversus Calvino-Papistas et Puritanos,' being an account of the sufferings of English Roman Catholics in the time of Elizabeth."

and fixes the date, of their separation from the national church. It was not upon *the promulgation of the Articles,* nor upon any other measure of the Church of England, but upon the *political regulations* which arose out of the formal excommunication of Elizabeth, in 1569, that Roman Catholics withdrew from the communion of our Church. Before that time, not even the oath of supremacy was a bar, as a general rule, to their admission even to civil, far less to ecclesiastical, privileges —the majority of them understanding this oath as a mere test of loyalty.*

"But as to the Articles, never, that I can find, were they urged, or felt, as a ground of disunion between the churches; and this fact, as I must consider it, is further attested by the statement so commonly made, that Rome *withdrew herself,* and not *was driven,* from our communion; and again by the plea, upon which the penal enactments, carried out from time to time in this country against Roman Catholics, have always been defended—viz. that they were enforced upon merely civil, and in no wise upon religious grounds. And if the 'unscrupulousness of Roman Catholics' in respect of oaths, and other civil obligations, be urged as the ground of the insufficiency of our formularies as means of excluding them, then it must be shown, *why they were eventually excluded.* For that they did refuse some tests, is undeniable." (pp. 28—31.)

Now before we proceed further, and give a full reply to these statements, I am anxious to place before the reader the passages here quoted from Fuller, in their *original state,* unmutilated, and in the *order* in which they stand in the work from which they are taken, putting in italics the parts omitted, for nothing perhaps will more tend to disabuse the mind of the

* Mr. Oakeley's note here is as follows—"See a Tract called the 'Execution of Justice in England,' (1583). 'These *seditious acts* . . . have made them traitors . . . *not their books,* nor their words, no, nor their cakes of wax which they call Agnus Dei,' &c. (p. 45.) Again, the Jesuits, addressing Queen Elizabeth, said, 'In the beginning of thy kingdom thou didst deal something more gently with Catholics: none were then urged by thee, or pressed either to thy sect, or to the denial of their faith.' Again, 'none were ever vexed *that way, simply for that he was either Priest or Catholic,* but because they were suspected (of disloyalty).'—Important Considerations, written by the Secular Priests against the Jesuits, 1601." For "words" in l. 3, read "beads."

reader of the erroneous impressions these garbled extracts might make, or to show him the necessity of caution in estimating the value of the statements we are endeavouring to answer.

Under the year 1570 Fuller observes,—"Hitherto Papists generally without regret repaired to the public places of Divine service, and were present at our prayers, sermons, and sacraments. *What they thought in their hearts, He knew who knoweth hearts; but in* OUTWARD CONFORMITY, *they kept communion with the Church of England.* In which sense one may say, that the whole land was of one language and one speech. *But now began the tower of Babel to be built, and Popery to increase, which brought with it the division of tongues, and the common distinction of Papist and Protestant, the former now separating themselves from our public congregations;* THEY WENT OUT FROM US, BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT OF US, FOR, HAD THEY BEEN OF US, THEY WOULD HAVE CONTINUED WITH US. *Indeed the Pope set his mark of favour on such reputed sheep, as absented themselves from our churches, henceforward accounting them goats that repaired thither. And now began the word recusant to be first born and bred in men's mouths. Which* (THOUGH FORMERLY IN BEING TO SIGNIFY SUCH AS REFUSED TO OBEY THE EDICTS OF LAWFUL AUTHORITY) *was now* CONFINED *in common discourse to express those of the Church of Rome.* Indeed hitherto the English Papists slept in a whole skin, and so might have continued had they not wilfully torn it themselves. *For the late rebellion in the North, and the Pope thundering out his excommunication against the Queen, with many scandalous and pernicious pamphlets daily dispersed, made her Majesty about this time, first to frown on Papists, then to chide, then to strike them with penalties; and last to draw life-blood from them by the severity of her laws. For, now the Parliament sate at Westminster, cutting* (*as one may say*), *with a three-edged sword, as making sharp edicts against Papists, Non-conformists, and covetous Conformists of the Church of England.* Against Papists it was enacted (see the Statutes, 13 Eliz.), that to write, print, preach, express, publish, or affirm, that the Queen was an heretic, schismatic, &c. should

be adjudged treason. *Also that it should be so accounted, and punished, to bring, and put in execution, any Bulls, writings, instruments, or other superstitious things, from the See of Rome, from the first of July following. A severe Act also was made against fugitives, who, being the natural born subjects of this realm, departed the same without license and fled into foreign parts.* Against Non-conformists it was provided, that every priest or minister, should before the Nativity of Christ next following, in the presence of his Diocesan, or his deputy, declare his assent and subscribe to all the Articles of religion, agreed on in the Convocation, 1562, upon pain of deprivation on his refusal thereof. Against covetous Conformists it was provided," &c. (pp. 97, 8. Cent. xvi. Bk. ix.)

By comparing the genuine passage, then, with Mr. Oakeley's extracts, it appears, first, that the passage quoted from Fuller to show that subscription to the Articles was enforced " after the revision of 1562," and that Roman Catholics nevertheless continued in the ministry of the Church of England for several years, follows the passage which he has placed after it, and applies to a period when the Roman Catholics, as a body, had altogether left the communion of the Church of England, as the passage when given entire *expresses in so many words;* secondly, that the sense in which it might be said, for a time, that the whole land was of one language, &c., was only as it respected "*outward conformity;*" which appears from the words suppressed; thirdly, that it was *not* upon any " political regulations," that " Roman Catholics withdrew from the communion of our Church," but that these " political regulations" *succeeded* their withdrawal, as the passage when fairly quoted fully shows; fourthly, that the alleged fact that the word recusant was not applied to the Papists till about the year 1570 has nothing to do with our present subject, because Fuller's statement applies not to those who being in the ministry of the Church declined subscription to the Liturgy or Articles while they were willing to remain in the communion of the Church, but to those who separated themselves from the communion of the Church. The real state of the case was, as is clear to any one acquainted with the facts of that period,

that as long as the Pope temporized, the majority of the Roman Catholic laity attended the services of the Reformed Church as required by law; but on the appearance of the Pope's Bull against the Queen, they were compelled to take an equally decided and public course, and separate themselves altogether from the communion of the Protestant Church. And hence though many had been recusants before, now *all* Papists were recusants, and the word began, as Fuller tells us, to be *confined* to Papists. But all this has nothing to do with the question of Papists *ministering* in the Church, or with subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. Nay more, if Mr. Oakeley's statement were correct, it would only tell against himself. For if the Romanists did not quit the ministry of the Reformed Church till the Act of the 13th of Elizabeth required them to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, what better proof could we have of the repugnance of those Articles to the doctrine of the Church of Rome? His statements in fact are characterized by the inextricable confusion which will always accompany similar attempts.

There are several other misstatements in this passage which we shall notice hereafter; but as it respected the extracts from Fuller, and the arguments founded on them, it seemed desirable to meet the matter at once.

After the passage just quoted there follow some remarks, written apparently to show, why the Reformers might have acted in the way the writer supposes them to have done; such as, that "with the English Reformers Protestantism was, as I may say, *an afterthought*," and similar observations; with which I cannot conceive it to be necessary to trouble the reader. And then he proceeds thus,—"To pass now from the composition of the Articles in 1552 to their revision and republication in 1562. If it be highly probable, both on *a priori*, and on historical, grounds, that their original framers drew them up with a studied reference to the views of those who retained their prepossessions in favour of the old Religion, this fact appears to be historically certain, in the case of Archbishop Parker, and the divines who remodelled them. Of these Doctor Heylin says,—'Their moderation is no less visible in

declining all *unnecessary determinations*, which rather tended to the multiplying of controversies, and engendering of strifes . . . . So that they seem to have proceeded by those very rules which King James so much approved of in the conference at Hampton Court. First, in not separating further from the Church of Rome, than that Church had separated from what she was in her purest times; secondly, in not stuffing the Articles with conclusions theological, in which a latitude of judgment was to be allowed, as far as was consistent with peace and charity. As they omitted many whole Articles in King Edward's book, and qualified the expressions in some others, so were they generally very sparing of anything which was merely matter of modality, or *de modo* only . . . . which rules being carefully observed by all the bishops, it was no wonder that they passed their votes without contradiction. But in taking the subscription of the Lower House, there appeared more difficulty. For though they all testified their consent unto them, yet, when subscription was required, many of the Calvinian or Zuinglian Gospellers, possibly* some also which were inclined rather to the old Religion, and who found themselves unsatisfied in some particulars, had demurred to it. (Hist. of Ref. Eliz. p. 159.) He adds, that at length all subscribed. This appears doubtful; (Strype, A. of R. c. xxviii.) however, very many, at all events, subscribed, including Roman Catholics.

"From all this it would appear, that the object, both of the original framers, and subsequent revisers, of the Articles, was to form a National Church upon the most comprehensive basis; consisting of all who could by any means be brought to subscribe its characteristic Formulary. Had they wished to exclude Roman Catholics, as persons holding views dangerous to the National Church, it is quite inconceivable why they

* Mr. Oakeley's note here is,—"This is remarkable. He speaks as if the objections had come rather from the other quarter. The passage is likewise important, as intimating that the Catholics (for it is a fact, vid. sup. p. 13, [30], that many were in the Convocation,) *demurred* to the terms of the Articles; did not, I mean, regard them as a mere *unmeaning declaration of conformity;* yet they eventually yielded."

should present (as they did) the Articles, again and again, to the members of Convocation, (many of whom had offices in the Church in the preceding reign,) until all, or nearly all, had subscribed them. Had their purpose in the Articles been what the modern view supposes, as soon as any Roman Catholic refused to sign, it would have been answered. They had framed their test, and it was successful. What then remained, but that the objectors should quit the ministry? Instead of which they took the best means in their power to overcome the scruple. (See Heylin, p. 159.) This certainly looks as if our divines did not try, like Luther and Calvin, to create a new Protestant community; but sought rather to remodel the existing and long-established English Church. And, though it be true, that they made a grievous mistake in admitting into it the elements (as proved by subsequent events,) of certain disunion, still, on the other hand, they seem to have acted in a Catholic spirit towards the representatives of the ancient Faith; not seeking to dispossess them of their place in the Church, provided only they were content to remain in it as *English*, and not as *Roman*, Catholics; to give up their adhesion to the Pope, *so far as it was inconsistent with the claims of the National Head*, retaining the while their belief in other points of the common Catholic Faith.* And so matters remained for several years, and so they might have continued, but for later events, which brought on a crisis; and which though, in themselves, (like the original differences with Rome under Henry VIII.) of a political, rather than a religious nature, produced an immediate, and most material, change in the visible relations of the Churches." (pp. 38—41.)

Such is the historical account Mr. Oakeley gives of the state of things in our Church during the first few years succeeding the Reformation. This is his proof of his position that the Articles were intentionally drawn up, so that they who held all

* Mr. Oakeley's note here is,—"The Roman Catholics of former times, who took the Oath of Supremacy, appear to have understood it, according to the interpretation proposed in Doctor Pusey's pamphlet on Tract 90, as a mere disclaimer of the Pope's *temporal* authority in this kingdom."

Roman doctrine (except perhaps that concerning the Papal jurisdiction) could subscribe them, and that Romanists did not quit the communion of our Church, or even, *as his argument assumes, its ministry*, until political regulations compelled them to do so. What these political regulations were, and how they produced this effect, Mr. Oakeley has left altogether unexplained. And it is much to be regretted that he did not carry his inquiries thus far, because the investigation might have opened his eyes to the real state of the case, and saved him from the promulgation of such statements as he has here made.

So far from political regulations driving the Romanists even from the *communion* of our church, the political regulations to which he refers were not passed till *after* that withdrawal had taken place, as is evident from the very passage he himself has quoted from Fuller, when perused in its *genuine* state. We shall hereafter find also that *before* the Pope's Bull of excommunication against the Queen, attendance on the services of our Church was so far from being an act that was thought *right*, (though winked at on the ground of expediency,) that it was thought to need *absolution*. Moreover this is a totally different point to the one in question, which concerns only the *ministry* of the Church. And the want of this distinction has introduced considerable confusion into Mr. Oakeley's statement. He reasons as if withdrawal from the communion and withdrawal from the ministry of the Church were the same things. Whereas they are entirely different. It was one thing to attend the services of the Church, when required so to do under a heavy penalty; and quite another, voluntarily to make a declaration that the Book of Common Prayer was agreeable to the word of God, and *officiate* according to it. The former was done probably by many Romanists for some years: the demand of the latter produced at once an extensive secession from the *ministry* of the Church. And as to subscription to the 39 Articles, which is the point in question, the *communion* of the Romanists with the Church for a time can decide nothing on that point, because ministers alone were ever called upon to subscribe; and even in their case subscrip-

tion was not required until 1571, soon after which Mr. Oakeley supposes they quitted the Church, a rather unfortunate notion for his argument. The only subscription required previously, was of the members of Convocation ; and, as we shall show presently, Mr. Oakeley's assertion of their having been signed in Convocation by any *professing* to hold characteristically Roman doctrine is altogether a mistake. In fact, consistent and honest Romanists had long before quitted the *ministry* of our Church on account of the Prayer-book. And before 1571, the period when subscription was required from the clergy generally, all professed Romanists had quitted not only the *ministry* but the *communion* of our church. And so far from its being the wish of our Reformers to retain in the ministry of our Church those who persevered in holding Roman doctrine, history shows us, as we shall endeavour to prove, that the very reverse was their object, (though they effected it with characteristic temperance, gradually and mildly,) and that the Articles were put forth and used as a test against Roman doctrine. In the Prayer-book they did what they could to avoid giving *unnecessary* offence to the Romanists, because *all* were required by Act of Parliament to attend the services of the Church. But in matters that respected the clergy alone, they used their best efforts to secure to the Church a Protestant ministry.

With these preliminary remarks we will now proceed to place before the reader *the proofs* that Mr. Oakeley's position (and consequently Mr. Newman's) in this matter is wholly untenable, noting by the way the errors of his statements.

First as it respects the original promulgation of the Articles in the reign of Edward VI.

Mr. Oakeley asserts, that " history gives no countenance whatever to the opinion that the Articles were drawn up with the view of excluding Roman Catholics ;" contenting himself with stating in proof of this, " With respect to the Articles of 1552, it seems doubtful, whether they were ever *enforced* ; if at all, it was but in few instances ;" adding the following extract from Strype in a note, " He (Cranmer) laboured to

have the clergy subscribe them; but against their will he compelled none."

Now here the reader will observe, that the very question at issue, whether Roman Catholics can consistently *subscribe* the Articles, is evaded; and there is substituted for it the question whether the Articles were drawn up for the purpose of *excluding* Roman Catholics; a purpose which of course they would not answer, *however Anti-popish*, if they were not *enforced*. But however adroit this substitution of one thing for another, it has led Mr. Oakeley into an argument fatal to his own cause. For his argument is,—the Articles were not drawn up to exclude Roman Catholics, *for* they were not enforced, as Cranmer would not compel those who were unwilling to sign them. Surely he must see, that this argument tells directly against himself. For whence the unwillingness to sign them, but because they militated against Roman doctrine? Cranmer's kindness in not "*enforcing*" them, so as at once to "*exclude* Roman Catholics," is an argument, that if they *had* been *enforced*, they *would* have *excluded* Roman Catholics; which is the only question with which we are concerned, now that the Articles *are* enforced.

We may just add on this question as to the enforcement of the Articles in the time of Edward VI., that the truth is, that, having been published only just before the King's death, there was not time to enforce them, though from the documents given by Bp. Burnet in the 3rd vol. of his History (Records, bk. iv. nos. vii. and viii.) it clearly appears to have been the intention, that subscription to them should be required from all the clergy, the royal mandates to this effect to the Dioceses of Canterbury and Norwich being there given. And a similar injunction was given respecting graduates to the University of Cambridge by the Visitors. (Ib. Rec. ix.)

Moreover (that it may not be supposed that the Romanists were left at liberty to inculcate their views as they pleased) we may remark further, that the power of the clergy to teach views disapproved of by those in authority had been taken away by a

general order, issued as early as the year 1548, prohibiting all from preaching but those who were expressly licensed by authority to do so; an order extending even to the bishops.*

But the sole question to be determined with reference to our present subject is, *What bearing the Articles had upon Roman doctrine.* And this Mr. Oakeley may learn from his own favourite authority, Dr. Heylin; who in the work quoted by Mr. Oakeley, speaking of the drawing up of the Articles of 1552 says, "For the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for stablishing consent, touching true religion, it was thought necessary to compose a Book of Articles: in which should be contained the common principles of the Christian faith, in which all parties did agree, together with *the most material points in which they differed.* For the better performing of which work Melancthon's company and assistance had been long desired;" † adding a little further on, "We return again to England, where we have seen a Reformation made in point of doctrine, and settled in the Forms of worship; the superstitions and corruptions of the Church of Rome entirely abrogated, and all things rectified according to the word of God and the primitive practice." ‡

And in another work on the Reformation, speaking of the Articles of 1552, he says,—"The clergy did compose and agree upon a book of Articles, containing the chief heads of the Christian faith; *especially with reference to such points of controversy as were in difference between the Reformators of the Church of England and the Church of Rome,* and other opponents whatsoever." §

And so, indeed, speak all our historians on this subject.

"Thus," says Burnet, "was the doctrine of the church cast into a short and plain form: in which they took care both to

* Strype's Eccles. Memor. ii. 1. 141, 2. Oxford ed.

† Hist. of Reform. Edward VI. p. 103.

‡ Ib. p. 123.

§ Reform. of the Church of England justified, in Miscell. Tracts, p. 13.

establish the positive articles of religion, and *to cut off the errors formerly introduced in the time of Popery.*" *

So Strype ;—" While the Parliament was sitting this winter, a synod also was held ; wherein was framed and concluded a book of Articles of Religion, taken out of the word of God, *purified and reformed from the errors of Popery* and other sects." †

Nay the very title of these Articles overthrows Mr. Oakeley's hypothesis. For it tells us they were published " ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem et consensum veræ religionis firmandum ;" or, as it is stated in the English edition of 1553,—" *to root out the discord of opinions, and establish the agreement of true religion.*" ‡

And thus it is stated in the " Warrant Book," as quoted by Strype, that they were agreed upon " for avoiding of *controversy in opinions*, and the establishment of a godly *concord* in certain matters of religion." §

So, then, while the *avowed object* of those who drew up the Articles was, to give a *decision* on the points of difference between the Protestants and Romanists, so as to prevent *controversies and diversities of opinions* on those points in our Church, Mr. Oakeley states that they intentionally worded the Articles so as to give *no decision at all* on those points, and leave it open to both Protestants and Romanists to sign them, and of course carry on their controversies within the Church.

And this statement is not made from his entertaining any notion of a similarity between Romish and Protestant doctrines, for thus he speaks on this point ; " The differences between Catholicism and Protestantism are so *fundamental and irreconcileable*, that if the Articles (as I have all along supposed) give free scope for near approximations to the extremes on *both sides*, they *must* involve the compatibility with honest

* Hist. of Reform. Pt. ii. bk. 1. a. 1551.
† Eccles. Memor. ii. 2. p. 24. (368 m.)
‡ See Sparrow's Collection of Articles, &c.
§ Eccles. Memor. ii. 1. p. 24. (368 m.)

subscription, of what, in the judgment of one or the other party, is *serious error. This consequence of the present argument may as well be frankly acknowledged at once, since it cannot be avoided.*" (p. 38.)

But further; not only does the title of the Articles directly oppose Mr. Oakeley's hypothesis, but the way in which they are spoken of in some documents of this period, to which we have just referred (p. 20), shows beyond contradiction the purpose they were designed to answer. I allude to the royal mandate to the Diocese of Norwich enjoining subscription, and the injunction of the Visitors of the University of Cambridge to the same effect.

Thus speaks the former document.—"Because it hath pleased Almighty God in this latter time of the world, after long darkness of knowledge, to reveal to this his Church of England, whereof we have under Christ the chief charge in earth, a sincere knowledge of the gospel, to the inestimable benefit of us and our people, redeemed by our Saviour Christ; we have thought it meet, and our duty, for *the pure conservation of the same gospel in our church, with one uniform profession, doctrine, and preaching, and for the avoiding of many perilous and vain opinions and errors, to send unto you certain Articles*, devised and gathered with great study and by counsel and good advice of the greatest learned part of our bishops of this realm, and sundry others of our clergy; which Articles we will and exhort yourself to subscribe, and in your preachings, readings, and teachings, to observe, and cause to be subscribed and observed, of all other which do or hereafter shall preach or read within your diocese. And if any person or persons, having benefice within your diocese, shall from henceforth not only refuse wilfully to set their hands to these Articles, but also obstinately exhort their parochians to withstand the same, and teach the people in a contrary way, our pleasure is, that being duly proved, ye shall advertise Us or our Council of the whole matter fully, to the intent such further order may by direction from Us or our said Council be taken, as the case shall require, and shall stand with justice and the order of our laws. . . . . And yet our meaning is, that if any party refuse to

subscribe any of these Articles, for lack of learning and knowledge of the truth, ye shall in that case by teaching, conference, and proof of the same by the Scriptures, reasonably and discreetly move and persuade him thereto, before you shall peremptorily judge him as unhable and *a recusant*. And for the trial of his conformity, ye shall according to your discretion prefix a time and space convenient to deliberate and give his consent," &c. &c.* Let Mr. Oakeley himself judge whether the language of this mandate is at all *reconcileable* with his hypothesis.

The other document is of a very similar character, but as the work of Bishop Burnet in which it is given is accessible to almost all readers, I will content myself with merely referring to it.

And now lastly let us inquire in what light these Articles were viewed on the accession of Queen Mary. "Never," says Mr. Oakeley, "that I can find, were they urged or felt as a ground of disunion between the churches." (p. 30.) But alas! poor Cranmer found to his cost that the Romanists looked upon them in a very different light, and found no such dexterous neutrality in them as Mr. Oakeley dreams of. *For the "heresies" contained in those very Articles formed one express ground of his condemnation.*

At the end of the Oxford edition of Strype's Memorials of Cranmer is given a copy of a MS. in the Lambeth Library entitled, "Processus contra Cranmerum Cant. Arch. A. D. 1555." The MS. "contains a copy of the official dispatch of Dr. Brokes, Bishop of Gloucester, to the Cardinal de Puteo at Rome, to whom the Bishop was subdelegate in the proceedings against Archbishop Cranmer, (the care of which had been consigned to the Cardinal by the Pope,) and is authenticated in the usual manner by notarial attestation."† From this curious and hitherto almost unnoticed document it appears that the seventh charge against Cranmer was as follows, — "Item ponit et articulatur procurator antedictus, et si negatum fuerit probare intendit, Quod prelibatus Thomas Cranmerus, ad pro-

* Burnet's Hist. of Reform. vol. 3. Records bk. iv. Rec. viii.

† See "Advertisement" to Strype's Cranmer, Oxf. ed. p. iv.

fundum malorum veniens (Christiana fide et religione penitus contemptis) in hereses suas quas longe antea imbiberat, et maxime contra venerabile eucharistie sacramentum, libros unacum copia istorum articulorum sibi ostensos propositos et traditos, ac in margine hujus articuli expressos sive designatos, eorumque vim formam tenorem et effectum edidit, lingua partim Latina partim Anglicana, saltem sic edi imprimique et orbi publicari fecit, etiam suo nomine, ipsasque hereses publice asseruit et docuit, ponit ut supra." And among the books here referred to as mentioned in the margin are "*Articuli de quibus Synodo Londonien' a°. d°.* 1552, etc." The others being, A defence of the true and catholic doctrine of the sacrament &c.; A discourse upon the sacrament of the Lord's Supper by Peter Martyr; the Catechismus brevis; and Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner.*

The eighth runs thus,—"Item ponit et articulatur procurator supranominatus, et si negatum fuerit probare intendit, Quod prefatus Thomas Cranmerus *articulis quibusdam hereticis,* maxime INTER CETERA contra veritatem veramque præsentiam corporis et sanguinis Christi in eucharistia, editis et conceptis, verumque et reale ac perfectum Christi corpus in ipso sacramento sub specie sive forma panis et vini notorie denegantibus,† sub nomine Cleri Cantuarien' falso editis et publicatis, pastores rectores et ecclesiarum curatos non paucos subscribere coegit fecit et compulit, ponit et articulatur ut supra."‡ The Archbishop's answer to this is, "Ad octavum respondet se nunquam coegisse aliquos hujusmodi articulis subscribere, tamen dicit quod plures clericorum provincie Cant' eisdem articulis volun-

* Strype's Cranmer, Oxf. ed. vol. ii. p. 1103.

† In the depositions of the witnesses against him other points are also specified. Thus Dr. Smith deposes to having heard him defend "hereses contentas in libris et articulis predictis, viz. non esse corpus Christi realiter in eucharistia, et non esse transubstanciationem panis et vini, tercio missam non esse sacrificium propiciatorium pro vivis et defunctis;" (ib. p. 1090); and Dr. Marshall,—"hereses in libris et articulis predictis contentas, viz. denegando præsenciam corporis et sanguinis Christi in eucharistia, ac transubstanciationem panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Christi, etiam misse sacrificium denegando." (ib. 1092.)

‡ Ib. p. 1103

taric subscripserunt, quorum subscripciones recepit ut dicit: et aliter negat articulum hujusmodi."*

The tenth charge is this,—" Quod idem Thomas Cranmerus in dicta Academia Oxonien' (publica disputacione secum ex more scholarum habita) libros et *articulos predictos* publice pro viribus defendebat, et sic, quatenus potuit, defendens exibilatus et *convictus* fuit, ponit et articulatur ut supra." And the eleventh,—" Quod memoratus Thomas Cranmerus quia sic libros *articulos* et hereses predict' pro viribus defendebat, et quia modo premisso convictus cedere et ab eisdem recedere pertinaciter recusavit, scholastico et academico Oxonien' decreto pro heretico et impio execratoque pronunciatus fuit et declaratus, librique et ARTICULI PREDICTI PRO HERETICIS IMPIIS ET EXE-

* Ib. pp. 1077, 8. From this charge it seems plain that the Articles of 1552 did not pass at least the Lower House of Convocation. And the same seems to follow from the wording of the Royal Mandate for their subscription to the Diocese of Norwich, given above, where all that is said of their authorship is, that they were " devised and gathered with great study and by counsel and good advice of the greatest learned part of our bishops of this realm, and *sundry others of our clergy*." The statement in their title that they were agreed upon in Convocation is fully explained in the answer of Cranmer at the disputation at Oxford in 1554. Dr. Weston accused him, " Also you have set forth a Catechism in the name of the Synod of London, and yet there be fifty, who, witnessing that they were of the number of the Convocation, never heard one word of this Catechism." To which Cranmer replies,—" I was ignorant of the setting to of that title; and as soon as I had knowledge thereof, *I did not like it*. Therefore, when I *complained thereof to the Council*, it was answered me by them, that the book was *so entitled, because it was set forth in the time of the Convocation*." (Fox's Acts and Mon. vol. 6. p. 468. ed. 1838.) Now, strictly speaking, the Catechism was not set forth with this title, but the Catechism and Articles were published *together*, and the title, in the *Latin* edition, was, " Catechismus brevis, Christianæ disciplinæ summam continens, omnibus ludimagistris authoritate Regia commendatus. Huic Catechismo adjuncti sunt Articuli, de quibus in ultima Synodo Londinensi, anno Domini 1552, ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem, et consensum veræ religionis firmandum, inter Episcopos et alios eruditos atque pios viros convenerat: Regia similiter authoritate promulgati;" and correspondently in the English edition. So that the words referred to by Weston applied only to the Articles, and so therefore must they be understood in Cranmer's reply. These facts appear to me to decide the long-disputed question whether those Articles had the sanction of Convocation; and *the Council must bear the blame of the title*.

CRATIS PRONUNCIATI SIMILITER ET DECLARATI FUERUNT, ponit et articulatur ut supra." *

Thus these Articles were adjudged by the University of Oxford to be "*heretical, impious, and execrable*," and for the "heresies" contained in them, among other like offences, Cranmer suffered.

Now those Articles are almost exactly the same as those to which subscription is now required. Mr. Oakeley himself, indeed, scarcely attempts to draw any distinction between the two. In fact the alterations introduced at the Revision in 1562 made them, on the whole, more stringent against the errors of the Church of Rome, as we shall hereafter show when we arrive at that period.

In short, the view taken by the Romanists of what was done in King Edward's days in the matter of religion may be briefly summed up in an extract from Harpsfield's sermon to the Convocation that met just after the accession of Queen Mary ;— "Neither had ceremonies their use, nor faith its soundness and integrity. nor manners their purity. They framed new sacraments, new rites, *a new faith*, new manners." †

We now come to the revival of the Reformation on the accession of Queen Elizabeth. And as this is the most important period in connexion with our present inquiry, and as Mr. Oakeley charges our Reformers with having pursued a neutral course, and maintains that men holding (avowedly, of course,) all Roman doctrine remained for several years in the ministry of the Church (which by the way would not prove his point, as subscription to the Articles was not then required), we shall extend our inquiries beyond the mere facts connected with the Articles, and mark the conduct of our Reformers in *other* matters, and the bearing of the *other* changes then introduced upon Roman doctrine, and their effect upon the Romish clergy, which will help us in ascertaining the intentions of our Reformers in the matter of the Articles.

On the accession of Queen Elizabeth, the first step taken

* Ib. p. 1104. † Strype's Eccles. Memorials, iii. 1. 63.

towards a reformation was to prohibit all preaching. So early as December 1558, the Queen (as Strype informs us) " forbad all preaching, and especially in London. And the latter end of December, a letter was sent to the Lord Mayor of London, with ten proclamations of one tenor, for the inhibition of preachers; which he was required to cause to be published the day after in divers parts of the city, and to be set up where the people might see and read. By virtue of which proclamation, not only all preaching was forbidden for a time, but all hearing and giving audience to any doctrine or preaching. And nothing else was allowed to be heard in the churches, but the epistle and gospel for the day, and the ten commandments in the vulgar tongue; but without any manner of exposition, or addition of the sense or meaning thereof."* This was succeeded by an order in the Queen's Injunctions, issued A. 1559, after the Popish bishops had left the church, that none were to preach even in their own cures without being expressly licensed to do so, either by the Queen, the Archbishop of the Province, the Bishop of the diocese, or the Queen's Visitors.† And when it was found in 1565 that divers of those so licensed had " deceived the expectation" of those who had licensed them, the Archbishop issued an order that all the licenses were to be recalled, and none to be considered valid but those that were issued subsequently to that time; and that all licensed from that time should be bound " not to disturb the state of religion established by public authority."‡

Thus an effectual stop was put to the inculcation of Romish doctrines in the churches.

And that this was the *object* contemplated is evident from the examination of one Faithful Commin in 1567 by Archbishop Parker before the Queen and her Council. He had been preaching without a license, and therefore was asked by the Archbishop, among other questions, " Wherefore would you dare to preach, having not got a license of permission

* Strype's Annals, I. 1. 59. See the Proclamation, ib. I. 2. 391.

† Wilk. Concil. iv. 182, 3.

‡ Strype's Parker, I. 376. & III. 113.

under some of our bishops' hands? *How shall we be assured that you are not of the Romish Church?*"*

The next step towards a Reformation, (and which shows how little intention there was of taking a neutral course,) was the appointment of a public disputation between the leaders of the Romish and the leaders of the Protestant party, by the Privy Council, to be conducted in their presence. The questions to be debated were these three. "1. Whether it was not against the word of God, and the custom of the ancient church, to use a tongue unknown to the people in the common prayers and the administration of the sacraments. 2. Whether every church had not authority to appoint, change, and take away, ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, so the same were done to edification. 3. *Whether it could be proved by the word of God, that in the mass there was a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead and the living.*"† This disputation, which commenced the last day of March 1559, appears, from the subjects ordered for discussion, to have been appointed with a view to hear what the Romanists could allege against the introduction of the Book of Common Prayer, for which a Bill was brought into Parliament in April, the second reading occurring on April 26.‡ The 3rd question particularly, involving one of the most important points in Roman Catholic theology, shows that no neutral or indifferent course was thought of; for had it been so, a public disputation on the points of difference would have been the extreme of folly. And the Protestant side in this disputation was sustained by the very men who were immediately afterwards raised to the highest posts in the church.

At the latter end of April passed the Bill for the re-introduction (with a few alterations) of the second Prayer-book of Edw. VI., the use of which was ordered by Parliament to commence on the 24th of June 1559.§ Among the alterations was the omission of the rubric in the Communion Office con-

* R. Ware's Foxes and Firebrands. Pt. 1. p. 18. This work is continually quoted by Strype. See respecting it Strype's Parker, Pref. p. xi.

† Burnet's Hist. of Reform. Pt. ii. bk. 3. a. 1559. See also Strype's Ann. I. 1. 128. &c.

‡ Strype's Ann. I. 1. 109. (75 m.)

§ Strype's Ann. I. 1. 200.

cerning the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, leaving the book without any direct and unequivocal dogmatical decision on that subject, and so far removing one impediment to its subscription by a Romanist. It seems not unlikely that the Queen's own mind was not thoroughly made up on the subject of the nature of the presence in the Eucharist; and as *all* were required to attend the services of the church, and *communicate* with it, the scruples and doubts of those whose minds were not made up on this point may have suggested the propriety of this course. In the present Prayer-book, however, no such concession has been made, as this rubric (with but a slight change) was replaced at the last Review in 1661; as we shall notice hereafter.

But now, how was this Prayer-book received? Do we find that it was considered consistent with Roman doctrine? Let us inquire. "It was upon the 8th of May," says Heylin, "that the Parliament ended, and on the 24th of June, that the public Liturgy was to be officiated in all the churches of the kingdom. *In the performance of which service, the bishops giving no encouragement, and many of the clergy being backward in it*, it was thought fit to put them to the final test, and either to bring them to conformity, or to bestow their places and preferments on more tractable persons."* Thus Bishop Jewell in a letter to Peter Martyr dated Aug. 1, 1559, tells him, "Now that religion is everywhere changed, the mass-priests absent themselves altogether from public worship."† Accordingly Commissioners were appointed to institute a general Visitation throughout the kingdom, in which it was required that all the beneficed clergy should make a subscription with their hands to what the Parliament had enacted concerning the restoring the supremacy to the Queen, and that the Book of Common Prayer and the Queen's Injunctions were "according to the true word of God, and agreeable with the doctrine and use of the primitive and apostolic church."‡ A full account of the proceedings of these Commissioners is given by Strype.§

* Hist. of Reform. Eliz. p. 114.
† Zurich Letters, Park. Soc. ed. p. 39.
‡ Strype's Ann. I. 1. 255.
§ Ib. 210, &s. 245—56.

At this Visitation, the Commissioners being empowered summarily to deprive those who refused to subscribe,* the number of recusants was (according to Strype and Camden) 189.† This, indeed, seems but a small number out of so large a body, "but then," (as Heylin, the most anti-Protestant of Protestant historians, remarks,) "we are to know withal, that many who were *cordially affected to the interests of the Church of Rome, dispensed with themselves in these outward conformities,* which some of them are said to do upon a hope of seeing the like revolution by the death of the Queen, as had before happened by the death of King Edward; and otherwise that they might be able to relieve their brethren, who could not so readily frame themselves to a present compliance."‡ This was the policy, which, as we learn from Strype, the Popish clergy had from the first resolved to pursue. When noticing the return of the exiles from abroad, on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, Strype remarks,—"As for the Popish clergy, they looked with a very angry and displeasant eye upon them; and of all things dreaded these learned men, lest they should take their places, and occupy room in the churches. And they seemed to make it one point of their policy, to keep the Protestant ministers (as much as they could) from officiating there; and for that purpose *counselled the priests and curates then in possession of ecclesiastical preferments and benefices, to comply with the constitution of religion that should be set up, that they might retain their parishes and places, and in the mean time, as opportunity served, exhort the people to hold and think well of their old superstitions.*"§ A curious illustration of such subscription is given by Strype in his Life of Parker. "Among

* Susceptæ religioni subscribere obstinate et peremptorie *recusantes.* See the Queen's Commission to the Visitors for the North, given by Burnet, Pt. 2, bk. 3, Rec. vii. There were many *recusants* therefore among the clergy as early as the year 1559.

† Strype's Ann. I. 1, 255. ‡ Hist. of Reform. Elizab. p. 115.

§ Annals I. 1, 154. (104 *m.*) There is a remarkable statement confirmatory of this in the Life of Archbishop Parker, inserted in some copies of his work "De Antiquitate Britannica," and given at length by Strype in his Life of Parker, Appendix, No. xc. (vol. iii. p. 272.)

some of the first subscribers," he says, " was Henry Syddal, a thorough-paced man, who being a Canon of Christ's Church, Oxon, had complied in the beginning of King Edward's reign, and was a great zealot the other way under Queen Mary, and one of those that were much about Archbishop Cranmer at Oxford, when he was induced to recant. His subscription I find again as Vicar of Walthamstow in Essex. And many such temporizing priests there were among those subscribers, some whereof got others to sign for them, *eorum vice et nomine.* And some of the *volens* are so written, as if they were *nolens* rather."* Some also subscribed, and then became *non-resident* to avoid being compelled to use the service, as Strype also informs us; under the year 1562 he says,— " The Church now, partly by former bad example, *and partly by dislike of, and withdrawing themselves from, the service now established,* had abundance of non-residents."†

We must also observe that although Strype and Camden make the number of the recusants 189, Dr. Lingard tells us, that "the Catholic writers make the number much greater."‡

And how speedily resignations multiplied, we may judge by the account given by Parkhurst Bishop of Norwich of the state of his Diocese in the spring of 1562, many months before the Articles were even brought before Convocation. In the Archdeaconry of Norwich, 80 parochial incumbencies were vacant. In the Archdeaconry of Norfolk, 182. In the Archdeaconry of Suffolk, 130. In the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, 42. So that in this diocese alone there were 434 parochial incumbencies void. And yet, notwithstanding this, it seems that in this very Diocese there was still reason to suppose that some were making but a feigned compliance with the religion established. For in a letter of Bishop Parkhurst to Bullinger, dated August 20, 1562, we find the following passage,—" I received a letter from my lord of Canterbury four days ago; the substance of it is this, that I should diligently ascertain by every means in my power, though secretly, who, and how many there are in my

* Bk. 2. c. 3. I. 154. † Ib. 432.

‡ Hist. of England, vol. v. p. 155. (ed. 1823.)

diocese, who do not comply with the true religion. This is, I suspect, with the intention of punishing their *breach of faith*."*

And at a still earlier period we have a similar account of the Diocese of Ely. For in a letter from Cox bishop of Ely to Archbishop Parker, dated Jan. 24, 1560, the bishop writes, "that of the whole sum of the cures in his Diocese, which was 152 parsonages and vicarages and other cures, there were duly served but only 52 cures. That there were 34 benefices vacant; thirteen that had neither rectors nor vicars; and fifty-seven enjoyed by non-residents." †

The bearing of this book, indeed, upon Roman doctrine, and the light in which it was viewed by the leading Romanists, are abundantly manifested by the testimonies, still extant, of the principal Romish bishops and divines of that period; and it is from their judgment, surely, that we are best able to draw a conclusion, how far subscription to that book can be considered to be consistent with the maintenance of all Roman doctrine.

Let us first observe, then, how the Book of Common Prayer was spoken of by the Roman Catholic Prelates in the House of Lords on the debate for its introduction by the Bill for Uniformity. This Bill, says Strype, "the Roman prelates in the House did tooth and nail stickle against."‡

And he proceeds to quote the speeches of Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster, and Scot, Bishop of Chester, on the subject; the whole of which he has preserved to us in his "Records."

A few extracts from these speeches will suffice.

"Having at this present," says Abbot Feckenham, "*two sundry kinds of religion here propounded and set forth before your honours*, being already in possession of the one of them, and your fathers before you, for the space of fourteen hundred years past here in this realm, like as I shall hereafter prove unto you; *the other religion here set in a book* to be received and established by the authority of this High Court of Parliament, and

* Zurich Letters, p. 122.

† Strype's Parker, bk. 2. ch. 2. I. 143, 4.

‡ Ann. I. 1. 109. The same testimony is borne also by Dr. Lingard, Hist. of Engl. vol. v. pp. 152, 3. (ed. 1823.)

to take his effect here in this realm at Midsummer next coming; and you being, as I know, right well desirous to have some proof or some knowledge, *which of both of these religions is the better, and most worthy to be established here in this realm, and to be preferred before the other,* I will for my part . . here set forth and express unto you, three brief rules and lessons, whereby your honours shall be able to put difference betwixt *the true religion of God and the counterfeit,* and therein never be deceived." And he then proceeds to show at some length, that "the new religion" delivered in the Prayer-book, ought to be discountenanced and driven out of the realm.*

"This Bill," said Dr. Scot, Bishop of Chester, "that hath been here read now the third time, doth appear unto me such one as that it is much to be lamented, that it should be suffered either to be read, yea, or any ear to be given unto it of Christian men, or so honourable an assembly as this is: for it doth not only call in question and doubt those things which we ought to reverence, without any doubt moving, but maketh further earnest request for alterance, yea, for the clear abolishing of the same. And that this may the more evidently appear, I shall desire your lordships to consider, that our religion, as it was here of late discreetly, godly, and learnedly declared, doth consist partly in inward things, as in faith, hope, and charity; and partly in outward things, as in common prayers and the holy sacraments uniformly ministered. *Now as concerning these outward things, this Bill doth clearly in very deed extinguish them, setting in their places I cannot tell what. And the inward it doth also so shake, that it leaveth them very bare and feeble* . . . . As concerning the first, that is, the weightiness of the matter contained in this Bill, it is very great; for it is no money matter, but a matter of inheritance, yea *a matter touching life and death, and damnation dependeth upon it. Here is it set before us as the Scripture saith, life and death, fire and water. If we put our hand into the one, we shall live; if it take hold of the other, we shall die.* . . . This we know, that this doctrine and form of religion, which this bill propoundeth to be abolished and taken away, is that which our

* Strype's Ann. I. 2, 431 et seq. Rec. No. ix.

forefathers were born, brought up, and lived in, and have professed here in this realm, without any alteration or change, by the space of nine hundred years and more; and hath also been professed and practised in the universal Church of Christ since the Apostles' time. *And that which we go about to establish and place for it, is lately brought in, allowed nowhere, nor put in practice, but in this realm only; and that but a small time, and* AGAINST THE MINDS OF ALL CATHOLIC MEN."*

These extracts will, I think, sufficiently show the sentiments of the Roman Catholic prelates on this book.

This book, also, Strype tells us, "highly offended papists *abroad* as well as at home: and they represented it to the world as though hereby all religion were abandoned in England."†

And he proceeds to quote the language of Hieronymus Osorius, a Portuguese bishop, on the subject, in a letter he published addressed to Queen Elizabeth. His words are these,—"Sacra, cæremonias, sacramenta . . . . omnino delevit."‡ He was answered by Dr. Haddon, who vindicated the doctrine and worship of our church from his reproaches.

The same language was used by Sanders, (a leading Romanist of that period, who died in 1581,) in the work entitled, "De schismate Anglicano;" and the account there given is of so much importance in connexion with our present subject that we shall present the reader with a considerable extract from it.

After noticing the Bill for Uniformity, and the effects that followed upon it, and some events of that period, the writer proceeds thus,—"The whole of England being divided into three parts, not one of the three was at that time hæretical, nor wished for or approved of *the change of religion;* much less afterwards when it had experienced the evils produced by the sect. For except many of the chief nobles, of whom we have spoken, the greater part of the inferior nobility was clearly

* Strype's Ann. I. 2. pp. 438 et seq. Rec. No. x.

† Ann. I. 1, 124.

‡ Epist. ad Eliz. p. 43; præfix. libr. voc. In Haddonum de relig. libri tres. Diling. 1576. 12mo.

catholic. The farming population also throughout the kingdom (an honourable and opulent class of men in that island) especially abhorred that novelty; nor did any other provinces of the kingdom than those which are near London and the Court, nor any other cities scarcely but those on the sea-coast, and in them more especially idle and dissolute youths, spendthrifts, women laden with sins, and other miserable creatures of a similar kind, willingly embrace *the heresy* . . Among those also who gave in to these views were some priests and curates of the inferior clergy, and not a few canons of cathedral or collegiate churches, who *heartily condemned the sect*, and sometimes from conscientious motives abstained from ministering according to those new offices, so that after the day fixed by law on which the true sacred rites were to cease and the false ones commence, *many churches throughout the whole kingdom were shut up for some months;* since the old priests would not willingly perform those schismatical sacred rites, and there was not yet a sufficient supply of new ministers to serve so many places. But when Elizabeth shortly after, in her care, forsooth, of all the churches, made a visitation of the clergy, and diligently inquired after those having the charge of parishes who did not perform the parliamentary rites in their parishes at the time appointed by law, MOST THROUGH FEAR OF LOSING THEIR PROPERTY AND BENEFICES COMPLIED WITH THOSE NEW SACRED RITES. But if there were any who resisted more firmly, or would not assent to them, she substituted for them other ministers of her own new creation, who should perform their duty; she compelled also the people, by a fine of twelve-pence being appointed for each person if absent on feast days, according to the Act of Parliament, to frequent the churches as before; which punishment was afterwards greatly increased, as shall be mentioned in its place. And thus it was effected either by violence or subtilty, that the greatest part of the Catholics, the danger of the thing not being yet clearly seen at this early stage, by degrees yielded to their enemies, so that they refused not to attend sometimes publicly the churches, sermons, communion and congregations of the schismatics. Yet so nevertheless as that in the mean

time they *took care that masses should be secretly celebrated at home, often by the very same priests who publicly officiated in the churches according to the spurious rites of the heretics*, sometimes by others not thus polluted by schism; and often in that mournful time they were partakers in one and the same day both of *the table of the Lord and the cup of devils*, that is, of the most holy Eucharist and of the Calvinistic supper. Nay what was still more wonderful and miserable, the priest sometimes *first consecrating at home, carried forth for the Catholics, whom he knew to be desirous of it, wafers consecrated according to the form used by the Church, which he gave them at the same time that he distributed the bread prepared after the manner of the heretics to the rest that cared less for the Catholic faith.* [The marginal note here is, "*The dissimulation of the Catholics to be condemned.*"] And I commit these things to writing, that other nations taught by our example, may both see the beginnings and progress of heresy, and guard themselves in time from such pests. In the meantime the Queen and her adherents thought from the first that things had turned out exceedingly well with them, in that when there were so many maintainers of the ancient faith in the kingdom, yet they should find that the majority either publicly embraced the rites prescribed by them, or sanctioned them, *however it might be but outwardly*, by their presence, although they might *inwardly hold another faith*, for which they did not much care, or at any rate thought *that it was best to dissemble for the time.* And they rejoiced not a little that some even of the priests did not refuse to officiate according to those rites; [the marginal note here is, "*the joy of the heretics at the dissimulation of the Catholics.*"] for they feared lest it should not be possible to bring them to do that, *against the example and command of all their bishops and prelates, as well as against their own conscience.* For they had not yet new ministers for thirty thousand and more parishes; and they thought it disgraceful that the greatest part of the churches should be suddenly shut up and left without any administration of the sacraments; and (which is common to

all heretics) they preferred at first, in order more easily to deceive the people, to make use of true priests than their own spurious presbyters . . . . . The new clergy in England was made up partly of *apostates from us*, partly of mere laymen."*

This remarkable passage appears to me to throw much light on the events of this period, and I think is calculated to show Mr. Oakeley that the real state of things at the time of the

* "Divisa autem omni Anglia in tres partes, ex tribus una non erat eo tempore hæretica, nec cupiebat aut probabat mutationem religionis, nedum postea, cum sectæ perniciem esset experta. Nam præter plurimos ex optimatibus præcipuis, de quibus diximus, pars major inferioris nobilitatis erat plane catholica. Plebs quoque, qui agriculturam per totum regnum exercet (honestum et opulentum in illa insula genus hominum) novitatem istam imprimis detestabatur; nec regni illius provinciæ aliæ, quam quæ sunt prope Londinum et aulam; nec civitates fere, nisi maritimæ, atque in istis præ cæteris otio et delitiis affluentes adolescentes, bonorum decoctores, mulieres onustæ peccatis, cæterique similis farinæ miselli, ultrò hæresim amplexabantur . . . . . Venerunt quoque in hanc ipsam sententiam nonnulli ex inferiori clero presbyteri et parochi, ecclesiarumque cathedralium vel collegiatarum Canonici *non pauci, qui ex animo sectam damnabant*, et aliquandiu etiam a faciendis istis novis officiis propter conscientiam abstinebant; adeo quidem ut post diem a lege præscriptum, in quo vera sacra cessare, falsa ista inchoare oportuit, *multa essent per totum regnum ad aliquod menses clausa templa;* cum presbyteri veteres schismatica sacra non lubenter facerent, et novorum ministrorum non esset adhuc tanta copia, ut tot locis inservirent. Sed cum Elizabetha paulo post, pro sua scilicet omnium ecclesiarum solicitudine, visitationem cleri fecisset, ac in parochos qui ritus parliamentarios in parochiis suis ad diem a lege præscriptum non obibant, diligenter inquisivisset, PLURIMI METU AMISSIONIS BONORUM ET BENEFICIORUM AD NOVA ISTA SACRA SE ACCOMMODABANT. Si qui autem essent qui constantius resisterent, aut non assentirentur, his alios ex nova sua creatione substituebat ministros, qui illos [sic] fungerentur munere; plebem etiam compellebat, in singula capita, si festis diebus abessent secundum Comitiorum edictum, duodecim assium indicta mulcta, ut ecclesias sicut prius frequentent; quæ pæna postea gravissime est aucta, ut suo loco dicetur. Atque ita vel vi vel arte factum est, ut maxima catholicorum pars, usque adeo his primis initiis non perspecto rei periculo, hostibus paulatim cederet, ut schismaticorum ecclesias, conciones, communionem ac conventicula, aliquando publice adire non recusarent. Ita tamen ut interim missas secretò domi per eosdem sæpe presbyteros, qui adulterina hæreticorum sacra in templis publice peragebant, aliquando per alios non ita schismate contaminatos, celebrari curarent; sæpeque et mensæ Domini, ac calicis dæmoniorum, hoc est, sacro-sanctæ Eucharistiæ, et cœnæ Calvinicæ, uno eodemque die illo luctuoso tempore participes fierent. Imo quod magis mirum ac miserum erat, sacerdos nonnunquam priùs rem sacram domi faciens, deferebat pro catholicis, quos ipse id desiderare cognoverat, hostias secundum formam ab Ecclesia usitatam consecratas, quas eo-

Reformation completely overthrows his theory. The revelations made in the above extract are not a little curious and important, as coming from a contemporary writer, and evidently stated with reluctance. After this there can be no difficulty in accounting for Romish subscriptions at that period.

Further in 1561 or 1562, Strype tells us, there were "questions and cases of conscience propounded and conveyed up and down by some papists, with solutions to them, agreeable to their purpose; to keep the laity, as well as the priests, from compliance and conformity to the present orders about religion."*

One of these papers falling into the hands of Pilkington, bishop of Durham, he reprinted it with a full answer.†

Among these "questions with solutions to them," are the following,—"IV. Whether be priests in schism that have subscribed to the religion now used in England?" The solution follows thus;—"In subscribing to this religion now used in England, they have both refused the power and authority which was given to them by the bishop, when they were made priests,

dem tempore iisdem dispensabat quo panes hæreticorum ritu confectos, cæteris Catholicæ fidei minùs studiosis, distribuebat. [The marginal note here is, "Damnanda Catholicorum dissimulatio."] Atque hæc mando literis, ut cæteræ nationes nostro exemplo edoctæ, et hæreseos principia ac progressus videant, et tempestive sibi ab hujusmodi pestibus caveant. Interim Regina et sui, ab initio præclare secum agi existimarunt, quod cum tot essent antiquæ fidei in regno cultores, plerosque tamen scirent, ritus a se præscriptos publice vel amplexari, vel præsentia sua *utcunque exteriùs* approbare; *licet interiùs aliam fidem de qua ipsi non adeo curabant, aut certe ad tempus dissimulandum censebant, colerent.* Ac ne sacerdotes quidem quosdam ab illis administrandis abhorrere, gaudebant non mediocriter: [the marginal note here is, "*Gaudium hæreticorum de Catholicorum dissimulatione.*"] timebant enim, ne contra exemplum et mandatum omnium Episcoporum ac prælatorum suorum, ac contra conscientiam suam, adduci non possent, ut id facerent. Neque enim adhuc habebant pro triginta et amplius parochiarum millibus, novos ministros, turpeque judicabant maximam templorum partem subitò claudi, omnique sacramentorum usu destitui; et (quod est hæreticorum omnium proprium) maluerunt ab initio, ad faciliorem populi deceptionem, uti veris sacerdotibus quam pseudopresbyteris suis . . . . . Clerus in Anglia novus, partim ex apostatis nostris, partim ex hominibus mere laicis factus." —De Schism. Anglic. lib. 3. pp. 340—3, & 350. (Col. Agr. 1610.)

* Ann. I. 1. 392 et seq.

† See Pilkington's Works, pp. 617, &s. Park. Soc. ed.

(that is to say, power and authority to consecrate and offer, and to celebrate mass for the quick and the dead;) and also they have refused their canonical obedience solemnly promised to the bishops with a kiss. And where the bishops of this realm with the clergy assembled at time of Parliament *would agree to no part of this religion,* (in witness whereof the bishops be in prison, and put from all their livings, *and a great number of the clergy have lost all their livings, some be in prison, some banished from their friends;* both the bishops and all the clergy that have lost their livings, are *all ready to suffer death afore they will consent to any part of this religion;* but all they which have subscribed, have forsaken the bishops, their true pastors and captains, obeying and following *wolves and apostates;* in witness whereof they have subscribed their names;) so separating themselves from the bishops and clergy they must needs be in schism."*

"IX. Whether is this to be called a wicked time, that such *heresy* and schism does reign?" The solution is,—"No, rather it is a blessed time: for now God 'tries his family' as St. Cyprian says; . . . . St. Paul says, 'It is meet that there be *heresy,* that the good may be tried;'" &c. &c. Bishop Pilkington in his "answer" says, "The time for trial of God's people we do not greatly mislike: only this grieves us, that so many withstand the manifest truth, which their conscience acknowledges to be true, and yet for fear of a change or flattery of the world, they be cold, and will not or dare not openly profess it; and also that another sort of *turn-tippets,* for lack of discipline, occupy the place of pastors, *serving rather to fill their belly, than for love, conscience, or duty;* where good order would, that either such should be displaced, or else do great and worthy open penance solemnly, afore they ministered."†

"XII. How should the people do, that cannot have the sacrament ministered to them according to the ordinance of Christ's Church?" The solution is,—"*In no wise they ought*

* Pilkington's Works, p. 621.

† Ib. pp. 632, 3.

to receive the communion, but to commend their minds and good wills to God with devout prayer, firmly continuing in that faith that they were christened in; which sith the apostles' time has ever been taught by blessed fathers in Christ's Catholic Church. And so being in will to receive the blessed sacrament, if he were in place where it is ministered according to the ordinance of Christ's Church, God will accept your will and good intent, as if you did receive it corporally; and by that will and intent ye be partakers of the sacraments and prayers of the universal Church of Christ in all christian countries and nations, as well as if you were present bodily. *But if you receive this communion, ye separate and divide yourselves from the sacraments and prayers of all the universal Church of Christ, and so wander in the way of perdition.*"*

Such were the views of consistent Romanists with respect even to the Book of Common Prayer; such their opinion of the priests that ministered, and the people that worshipped, according to it.

Again, in 1580, the celebrated Romanist, R. Parsons, published under the assumed name of John Howlet, "Discourse, containing the reasons why Catholics refuse to go to Church," (pretended to be printed at Douay,) which was answered by Dr. Fulke in a "Brief Confutation of a Popish Discourse, by John Howlet, or some other bird of the night. 1581." 4to. The discourse is reprinted in Dr. Fulke's answer, and from this reprint are extracted the following passages.

"The first reason why I being a Catholic in mind may not go to the churches or service of *the contrary religion,* is because I persuading myself their doctrine to be false doctrine and consequently venomous unto the hearer, I may not venture my soul to be infected with the same. (fol. 11.)

In the second reason he says,—"that a Catholic going to the churches, service, or prayers of them of the contrary religion cannot but commit this great sin of scandal in the highest degree . . . . it is evident to all the world." (fol. 16.)

"The sixth cause why a Catholic may not come to church, is, because he cannot come *without dissimulation.*" (fol. 29.)

* Ib. pp. 637, 8.

"The seventh reason why a Catholic may not yield to come to the Protestants churches, is because the service which they use is naught and dishonourable to God;" and among the reasons for this charge against the service, the third is, "their service is naught because they have divers *false* and *blasphemous* things therein." (fol. 32, 3.)

Precisely similar was the language used in Queen Mary's time of King Edward's Book. Thus Dr. Weston, the Prolocutor of her first Convocation, in his address to Convocation, calls it a book "stuffed with blasphemies, stored with errors, which, under the name of religion, took away religion."*

And thus speaks a celebrated modern Romanist as to the alleged attendance of Romanists at the Protestant churches during the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign;—"Perhaps," he remarks, sarcastically, "hearing the parson exercise his gift, and (it may be) censuring him for it, was not then esteemed a badge of Protestant communion. *This, indeed, might bring for a time both Catholics and Protestants into one assembly; but could no more make them either of one religion or of one communion, than it makes Quakers of all those that have the curiosity to hear their pious groans.*"†

I will add one more testimony.

It appears from Strype under the year 1568, (and therefore before the issuing of the Bull against the Queen,) that priests were appointed in England, by the authority of the Pope, who among other things had power to "absolve them that had taken any oath to the Queen as supreme, or *gone to church and heard common prayer.*"‡

Such, then, was the view taken by those who surely were best acquainted with the real nature of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, of the Liturgy of our Church, and the conduct of those Romanists, who even "heard" it.

How stands the case, then, with respect to our Liturgy? Can it be consistently subscribed by one who holds all Roman doctrine?

* Strype's Eccles. Memor. iii. 1. 71.

† Dr. Hawardine's True Church of Christ shewed. Vol. 1. p. 9. sec. ed. 1738. See also p. 105, where he points out some of the errors (according to his views) of our Liturgy.

‡ Strype's Ann. 1. 2. 259, 260.

Intimately connected with this inquiry as to *the principle* by which our Reformers went, in arranging and fixing the standards of doctrine and worship in our Church, is their conduct with respect to altars and images in churches.

On both these points the Queen at first seems to have hesitated, but the leading Protestant divines having joined in drawing up and presenting an address to her on each of them, urgently entreating her to consent to their removal, she followed their advice.

The reasons drawn up to be offered to the Queen's Majesty's consideration, "Why it was not convenient that the communion should be ministered at an altar," are given at length by Strype;* who adds, "from this notable paper of address to the Queen, she yielded to the taking away the altars, as by the effect it appeared," referring to her "Injunctions."† And from these "reasons" it clearly appears, that their object in this matter was to oppose and root out the popish doctrine of a sacrifice in the eucharist. "An altar," they say, "hath relation to a sacrifice; for they be *correlativa:* so that of necessity, if we allow an altar, we must grant a sacrifice." Again; "Whereas your Majesty's *principal purpose is utterly to abolish all the errors and abuses used about the Lord's Supper,* especially to root out *the Popish mass,* and all superstitious opinions concerning the same, the altar is a means to work the contrary, as appeareth manifestly by experience. For in all places the mass-priests . . . . are most glad of the hope of retaining the altar, &c., meaning thereby to make the communion as like a mass as they can, and so to continue the simple in their former errors." Nor did anything more offend the Romanists in the changes that then took place than this removal of the altars,‡ recognizing as they did in this act the denial of one of the most important tenets of their faith. Such was the

* Ann. ch. 12. I. 1. 237, &s.

† I have already given the testimonies on this subject so fully in a pamphlet entitled "Altars prohibited by the Church of England," (in two parts,) that I do not feel it necessary to enlarge here respecting it.

‡ See "Altars Prohibited" in various parts.

"*neutral*" course adopted by our Reformers, and their *unwillingness* to oppose and protest against Popery!

An address of the leading Protestant divines to the Queen for the removal of images from the churches is given by Strype and Burnet;* in which they give "those authorities of the Scriptures, reasons, and pithy persuasions, which as they have moved all such our brethren, as now bear the office of bishops, to think and affirm images not expedient for the Church of Christ; so will they not suffer us, without the great offending of God and grievous wounding of our own consciences, (which God deliver us from,) to consent to *the erecting or retaining of the same in the place of worshipping;* and we trust, and most earnestly ask it of God, that they may also persuade your Majesty, by your royal authority, and in the zeal of God, *utterly to remove this offensive evil out of the Church of England,* to God's great glory and our great comfort." And they conclude, "We most humbly beseech your Majesty to consider, that besides weighty causes in policy, which we leave to the wisdom of the Honourable Counsellors, the establishing of images by your authority, shall not only utterly discredit our ministries, *as builders of the thing which we have destroyed,* but also blemish the fame of your most godly Brother, and such notable Fathers as have given their lives for the testimony of God's truth, who by public law removed all images."†

This document, according to Bishop Burnet, was drawn up in the early part of the year 1559; and he adds,—"These reasons prevailed with the Queen to put it into her 'Injunctions' to have all images removed out of the church."

The 23rd Injunction is as follows,—"Also, that they shall take away, utterly extinct, and destroy all shrines, coverings of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindals and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition, so that there remain no

* See Strype's Ann. ch. 18. I. 1, 330, &s., and Life of Parker, I. 191, &s. Also Burnet's Hist. of Reform, Pt. 2. bk. 3, and Records, ib. No. vi. The fullest account of this document is in the latter.

† Burnet's Hist.; Records, *ut supra cit.*

memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses; preserving nevertheless or repairing both the walls and glass windows; and they shall exhort all their parishioners to do the like within their several houses."*

In the Articles of Visitation, which followed shortly after, for the direction of the Royal Commissioners in their general Visitation, the word "images" is added. The second article of inquiry is,—"Whether in their churches and chapels all images, shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindals and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned and false miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition be removed, abolished, and destroyed."† And the 9th is,—"Whether they use to declare to their parishioners anything to the extolling or putting forth of vain and superstitious religion, pilgrimages, *relics, or images*, or lighting of candles, kissing, kneeling, or decking of the same images." ‡

Whether the word "images" was intentionally left out of the "Injunctions," or it was thought that the other words included them, must be left to the reader to determine. If the former was the case, it must be supposed that the Queen had not then made up her mind. But at any rate the word is expressly used in the succeeding Articles of Visitation; so that it is clear that the advice of the divines prevailed.§

And hence in Archbishop Parker's Articles of Visitation a few years after, the sixth is,—"Whether images and all other monuments of idolatry and superstition be destroyed and abolished in your several parishes."‖

So decided also became the Queen afterwards in this matter, that on the presentation of a Prayer-book to her, adorned with pictures, by the Dean of St. Paul's, on Jan. 1, 156$\frac{1}{2}$, she testi-

* Wilk. Concil. iv. 185.

† Wilk. Concil. iv. 189. ‡ Ib.

§ Strype dates the above document 1560 or 1561, but this must be a mistake; as images are clearly prohibited in the Articles of Visitation. From the date of it, the bishops alluded to in it must be those by whom Parker was afterwards consecrated.

‖ Wilk. Conc. iv. 258.

fied great displeasure. The colloquy between her and the Dean on this occasion has been preserved, and part of it is as follows,—"Q. You know I have *an aversion to idolatry, to images, and pictures of this kind.* D. Wherein is the idolatry, may it please your Majesty? Q. *In the cuts resembling angels, saints:* nay, grosser absurdities, resembling the Blessed Trinity. D. I meant no harm, nor did I think it would offend your Majesty, when I intended it for a New-year's gift. Q. You must needs be ignorant then: have you forgot our Proclamation against *images, pictures, and Romish relics* in the churches? Was it not read in your Deanery? D. It was read; but be your Majesty assured, I meant no harm when I caused the cuts to be bound with the Service-book. Q. You must needs be very ignorant to do this after our prohibition of them." *

Surely nothing can show more clearly than these facts the firm and decided manner in which the principles of the Reformation were carried out.

And as we have had occasion to advert to a supposed hesitation in the mind of Queen Elizabeth, in adopting the views of the reforming divines in one or two points, it may be well to show before we proceed further, that any such hesitation was *limited* to those matters. Her opposition to the doctrines of Popery generally was firm and uncompromising.

Thus when in December, 1559, the deprived Popish bishops warned her not to listen to those who were persuading her "to embrace schisms and heresies in lieu of the ancient Catholic faith," she replies in these terms;—"Our realm and subjects have been long wanderers, walking astray, whilst they were under the tuition of Romish pastors, who advised them to own a wolf for their head (in lieu of a careful shepherd), *whose inventions, heresies, and schisms be so numerous, that the flock of Christ have fed on poisonous shrubs for want of wholesome pastures.* And whereas you hit us and our subjects in the teeth, that the Romish Church first planted the Ca-

* Foxes and Firebrands, Pt. 3. p. 21, &s. The narrative is reprinted hence by Strype, Annals, ch. 23, vol. i. pt. 1. p. 408, &s.

tholic faith within our realms, the records and chronicles of our realms testify the contrary; and your *own Romish idolatry* maketh you liars; witness the ancient monument of Gildas; unto which both foreign and domestic have gone in pilgrimage there to offer."*

"The next endeavour," says Strype, "of the bishops deprived, and others of the Popish clergy, was to get the free exercise of their religion, contrary to the law established."† And they got the Emperor Ferdinand and other Roman Catholic princes to write to the Queen, asking her to allow them churches in the cities. Now let us mark the terms in which this request is refused. "As to what your Majesty further intercedes for in their behalf," writes the Queen, "that certain churches should be set apart for them in each city, in which they may safely and without hindrance celebrate their rites by themselves, this request is such, and involved in so many difficulties, that we cannot, consistently with the safety of our state, and the preservation of our honour and conscience, grant it. For we and ours (thanks be to God) do not follow any new or strange religion, but that very religion which has the consentient mind and voice of the most illustrious Fathers in its favour. But to grant a church to rites of a different kind, besides its opposition to the laws of our Parliament, would be nothing else than to sow *various religions* (serere religionem ex religione), to distract the minds of the good, to cherish the designs of the factious, to disturb religion and the commonwealth in this our now quiet state;" &c.‡

And when, soon after, the Duke of Anjou, a Romanist, treated with the Queen on the subject of marriage, stipulating for a "*toleration* of the *Romish religion*," the Queen's answer was as follows,—"Although the outward exercise of Christian religion may haply be tolerated with different rites and ceremonies, amongst the subjects of one and the same kingdom; yet a different, yea, *a flat contrary* exercise between us who

* Strype's Ann. ch. xi. I. 1, 217, 18. † Ib. p. 220.

‡ See Strype's Ann. ch. xxxvi., I. 2. 47, 8, and App. I. 2. 574, where the original (in Latin) is given; from which I have translated the above.

am Queen and whosoever shall be our husband, will not only seem perilous but also absurd. . . . . By *tolerating your religion*, we break the laws established and give offence to our best subjects," &c. *

Can words more plainly express than those used in these documents the *direct* and *intended* antagonism, on (to say the least) various important points, of the two systems of the Church of Rome and the reformed Church of England ?

From these proceedings of the Queen let us pass on to those of Archbishop Parker and the Royal Commissioners about the same period.

In September, 1560, the Archbishop held a metropolitical visitation of the Cathedrals of his Province; when the seventh Article of Inquiry was as follows,—" You shall inquire of the doctrine and judgment of all and singular heads and members of this your church . . . . . Whether any of them do *either privily or openly* preach or teach any *unwholesome, erroneous* or seditious doctrine; or discourage any man, soberly for his edifying, from the reading of the holy Scripture; or in any other point do persuade any not to conform themselves to *the order of religion reformed*, restored, and received by public authority in this Church of England. As for example; to affirm and maintain, that the Queen's Majesty that now is, and her successors, Kings and Queens of this realm of England, is not, or ought not to be, head, or chief governor of this her people, or Church of England, as well in ecclesiastical causes or matters, as temporal; or that it is not lawful for any particular church or province to alter rites and ceremonies: *to edify or extol any superstitious religion or relics*, pilgrimages, lightings of candles, kissing, kneeling, or decking of images, or *praying in a tongue not known, rather than in English*, or to put trust in a certain number of Pater-nosters, or *to maintain purgatory, private masses*, trentals, or any other *fond fantasies invented by men, without ground of God's word:* or to say, teach, *or maintain*, ... that the word of God doth command sole life, or abstinence from marriage, to any

* Foxes and Firebrands, Pt. 3. p. 13.

minister of the Church of Christ; or *any other errors or false doctrine, contrary to the faith of Christ and holy Scriptures.*"*

Indeed for Archbishop Parker's zeal and diligence in purifying the Church of Romish errors and abuses, we have the testimony even of Grindal and Horn in a joint letter written by them a few years after this (dated Feb. 6, 1567), to H. Bullinger and Rodolph Gualter, in which they say of Parker,—"that prudent father, learned as he is, and exceedingly well-disposed (optime affectus) towards the propagation of the most pure religion, is exceedingly anxious, and earnest, and active in entirely washing away the Romish dregs of every kind." †

And as it respects the Commissioners, thus speaks Strype of the spirit by which they were actuated, placing his remark under the marginal title, "*By what principle the Reformers went;*"—"While these Commissioners," he says, "were thus sitting, and employed about religion, THEIR GREAT MAXIM WAS TO PURGE THE CHURCH AS MUCH AS THEY MIGHT FROM ALL POPISH DREGS AND SUPERSTITIONS."‡

The objects and views of the authorities both in Church and State, when arranging our standards of doctrine and worship, may be judged of by the celebrated work of Jewell, published about this time under the highest sanctions, entitled "An Apology or Answer in defence of the Church of England, with a brief and plain declaration of the true religion professed and used in the same." Of this work Strype says,—"In these proceedings in religion, it was also wisely foreseen by the Archbishop and his colleagues, how the world would take them; and therefore it was thought necessary by them, that some public apology, or manifesto, should be set forth, to vindicate the Church of England before all the world, for her departure from the Bishop of Rome, and for her rejection of his pretended authority, and *for what was done in reforming religion.* This work was, as it seems, recommended to Bishop Jewell; and he performed it in a short time to a wonder. The copy was sent

* Strype's Parker, ch. 2. I. 146—8.

† Zurich Letters, P. S. ed. p. 181 and App. p. 107.

‡ Strype's Parker, I. 196.

this year, 1561, to Secretary Cecil, for his judgment, and the Queen's approbation. And in September the Archbishop put him in mind of reviewing and sending it back, in order to the publishing; giving him this hint in the close of a letter, that he hoped he forgat not the Apology. It came forth in Latin the next year, and soon after in English."* In this English translation (published in 1562) Strype tells us "the Archbishop had a considerable hand."† In 1564 another translation made by the Lady Anne Bacon, was published by the Archbishop himself, as appears by a letter of the Archbishop to the translator prefixed to this edition of the book; in which also the Archbishop calls the Apology a "*public work.*"‡ This book, says Strype, "was approved by the allowance and authority of the Queen, and published by the consent of the bishops and others."§—"Of what esteem and reputation it was in the Church of England in these times, appears by *a state-book*, set forth the year after; 'I refer you to the Apology, which our Church hath placed openly before the eyes of the whole christian world, as the common and certain pledge of our religion.' (Ad Apologiam ablego, quam ecclesia nostra tanquam communem et certam nostræ religionis obsidem, palam in oculis orbis christiani collocavit. *Gual. Haddoni Ep. Hier. Osorio.*) So that it was written upon a state account by the common advice and consultation, no doubt, of the college of divines that were then met about reformation of the church. And so the reverend author himself shewed *in his epistle to Queen Elizabeth before his Defence, viz., that it contained the whole substance of the catholic faith, then professed and freely preached throughout all the Queen's dominions:* that thereby all foreign nations might understand

* Strype's Parker, I. 197. † Ib. p. 357.

‡ Strype's Parker, I. 355. In his "Annals," (I. 1. 428.) Strype states that the *other* English translation published in 1562 was done by the same lady. Are the translations the same, and the edition of 1562 the *first* edition of it?

§ Strype's Ann. ch. 25. I. 1. 424. These words are translated from Lawrence Humphrey's "Vita Juelli," published Lond. 1573, 4to., where he says,—"Anno Domini 1562 edita est Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Apologia: quæ licet Regiæ Majestatis autoritate et assensu probata, et de consilio Episcoporum aliorumque publicata sit, tamen ab hoc autore pertexta et conscripta est, tanquam omnium Anglorum fidei Catholicæ et Christianæ publica confessio." (p. 177.)

the considerations and causes of her doings in that behalf."* So Collier, the nonjuror, tells us, that this work "was approved by the Queen and set forth with the consent of the bishops."† Bishop Jewell himself in his Reply to Harding says that he had the concurrence of the whole English clergy with him in this work. "My choice," says Bishop Randolph in his Preface to his Enchiridion, "has been principally directed to such works as had the sanction of public authority, and which may, therefore, be relied on as containing the final and decided opinions of our Reformers, approved of in the general by the church at large. . . . . Of this kind, that is, thus publicly received, were Jewell's Apology and Nowell's Catechism; the former of which is said to have been published with the consent of the bishops, *and was always understood to speak the sense of the whole church, in whose name it is written.* . . . . . Both these works were publicly received and allowed." (Enchirid. theolog.; Pref) "By Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles, and four successive Archbishops, the Apology was ordered to be read and chained up in all parish churches throughout England and Wales."‡ It is quoted by Hooker as "the English Apology;"§ and lastly, as decisive of its authority, it is recognised in the thirtieth of the canons of 1604 as "the Apology of the Church of England."

I have given more space to these various testimonies in proof of the authority of this work, as exhibiting the spirit and principles of those who settled our legal standards of doctrine and worship, and giving a *general view* of the doctrine it was their object to maintain, than some perhaps may think necessary. But the value and importance of this treatise at the present period, it would be difficult to overrate; and therefore it is desirable that there should be no doubt as to the degree of authority that belongs to it.

Now what is the testimony of this book as to the religion then established in England?

It appears from it that the Romanists directly charged that religion with being *heretical*, and the cause of all sorts of

* Strype's Ann. ch. 25. I. 1. 425, 6.
† Hist. vol. 2. p. 479.
‡ Watt's Biblioth. Britann., under "Jewell."
§ E. P. ii. 6.

evil and confusion. "They cry out upon us at this present everywhere," says Jewell, "that we are all *heretics*, and have *forsaken the faith*, and have with new persuasions and wicked learning utterly dissolved the concord of the church. That we renew, and, as it were, fetch again from hell the old and many a day condemned heresies: that we sow abroad new sects, and such broiles as never erst were heard of: also that we are already divided into contrary parts and opinions, and could yet by no means agree well among ourselves," &c.*

And what is Jewell's answer? Is there any tenderness shown towards "Roman doctrine?" Does he intimate that the doctrine of the Church of England is such that both Romanists and Protestants might (if only the former would give up the point of the jurisdiction of the Pope) conscientiously interpret it as consistent with their own views? On the contrary, the protest against Romanism is clear, definite, and decided. It can hardly be necessary to quote much from a work so well known; a few extracts will be sufficient.

After speaking of the separation they had made of the Anglican from the Romish Church, Jewell remarks,—"For our parts, if we could have judged *ignorance, error, superstition, idolatry, men's inventions*, and the same commonly disagreeing with the Holy Scriptures, either to please God, or to be sufficient for the obtaining of everlasting salvation; or, if we could ascertain ourselves, that the Word of God was written but for a time only, and afterward again ought to be abrogated and put away; or else, that the sayings and commandments of God ought to be subject to man's will, that whatsoever God saith and commandeth, except the Bishop of Rome will and command the same, it must be taken as void and unspoken: if we could have brought ourselves to believe these things, we grant, there had been no cause at all, why we should have left these men's company. As touching that we have now done, *to depart from that church whose errors were proved and made manifest to the world, which church also had already evidently departed from God's word*, and yet not to depart

* Works, ed. 1611, pp 10, &s.

so much from itself, as from the errors thereof, and not to do this disorderly or wickedly, but quietly and soberly, we have done nothing herein against the doctrine either of Christ or of his apostles."* "If that church may err which hath departed from God's words, from Christ's commandments, from the apostles' ordinances, from the primitive church's examples, from the old Fathers and Councils orders, and from their own decrees; and which will be bound within the compass of none, neither old or new, nor their own, nor of others, nor man's law, nor God's law; then it is out of all question, that the Romish church hath not only had power to err, but also that it hath shamefully and most wickedly erred in very deed."† "We have renounced that church, wherein we could neither have the word of God sincerely taught, nor the sacraments rightly administered, nor the name of God duly called upon." ‡ "We so have gotten ourselves away from that church, which they had made a den of thieves, and wherein nothing was in good frame, or once like to the church of God, and which, by their own confessions, had erred many ways, even as Lot in times past gat him out of Sodom, or Abraham out of Chaldee, not upon a desire of contention, but by the warning of God himself: and . . . we have searched out of the Holy Bible, which we are sure cannot deceive us, one sure form of religion, and have returned again unto the primitive church of the ancient Fathers and Apostles, that is to say, to the ground and beginning of things, unto the very foundations and headsprings of Christ's church."§

Mr. Oakeley affirms, that "the later Church of England has been, from first to last, remarkably unwilling to protest, as a church, against the doctrines of Rome." (p. 28.) Now (putting aside for a moment the 39 Articles, as the subject more particularly in question) what more energetic protest against the doctrines of Rome can be conceived than that contained in this work? And this treatise was put forth under the especial sanction of our Reformers, *in order to show the world the views and principles under the influence of which they were acting.* It was formally approved by the Queen, and spoken of by the Primate as a "pub-

* Jewell's Works, ed. 1611. Defence, &c. pp. 395-7.

† Ib. p. 499. ‡ Ib. p. 511. § Ib. p. 644.

lic work ;" it " was always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church in whose name it is written ;" and is recognized in the 30th canon as " the Apology of the Church of England." It is difficult therefore to draw much distinction between it and a document issued by the Church " as a Church." Certainly, the formal sanction of Convocation, which no one doubts that it virtually had, was the only thing wanting to constitute it such when it was published ; and indirectly it has since received that sanction. At any rate it was a manifesto of the Reformers showing the nature of the course they were pursuing and the objects they had in view ; and from which therefore we may easily conclude, how far they were likely to draw up or sanction a confession of faith for our Church, which should leave it exposed to the " error, superstition, and idolatry," which had been the cause of its separation from the Church of Rome.

Let us now proceed, then, to consider the steps taken for settling the standard of doctrine of our Reformed Church.

The first act in this direction was the drawing up, at the commencement of 1560, that is, as soon as possible after the consecration of Archbishop Parker and some other bishops, " a declaration of certain principal articles of religion, set out by order of both archbishops metropolitans, and the rest of the bishops ; *for the unity of doctrine to be taught and holden of all parsons, vicars, and curates :* as well in testification of their common consent in the said doctrines, *to the stopping of the mouths of them that go about to slander the ministry of the Church for diversity of judgment,* as necessary for the instruction of their people. To be read by the said parsons, vicars, and curates *at their possession-taking, or first entry into their cures,* as also after that, yearly at two several times," &c.*

In this " Declaration," among other directly anti-Romish propositions, it is maintained " that the doctrine which maintaineth the mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead, and a means to deliver souls out of purgatory, is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance, nor grounded upon doctrine

* Strype's Ann. ch. 17, I. 1. 325, reprinted hence by Wilkins and Cardwell, but with the date 1559.

apostolic, but contrariwise, most ungodly and most injurious to the precious redemption of our Saviour Christ, and his only sufficient sacrifice, offered once for ever upon the altar of the cross;" and that the taker of it "utterly disallows the extolling of images, relics, and feigned miracles," &c.*

Surely these statements are plain enough. Neither Mr. Newman nor Mr. Oakeley, I suppose, will venture to say, that they are so drawn up as to enable Romanists to take the Declaration. True, the clergy were not all called upon *immediately* to make this "Declaration;" and here I humbly venture to think the Reformers showed their wisdom. They required assent to the Prayer-book, because that was necessary to secure to the people a pure form of worship; and they permitted none to preach but those whom they had expressly licensed to do so; but in requiring assent to full statements of doctrine they proceeded more slowly and cautiously. The articles thus set forth were intended to *promote* purity and unity of doctrine throughout the Church; but a formal declaration of assent to them was not required from the clergy generally, but only from those who might be *subsequently* admitted to cures, so that their effect might be *gradual* but *sure*. This is shown in the title, as already quoted; and so the case is represented by Strype when first noticing the matter,—"*Now*," he says, "care was taken by those in commission for religion to supply *vacant* churches, and that fit men might be provided to officiate in them. And for that purpose those that were *admitted to curacies* were bound to subscribe certain articles of doctrine, and other articles for their behaviour and obedience in the discharge of their ministry."†

And his remark upon the "Declaration" is this,—"Such was the pastoral care of Archbishop Parker, by whom, I believe, this Declaration was chiefly framed, that so all that *came into* livings and served in the Church, might be purged of *popish doctrines and superstitions*, and to make the best security he could of admitting none to officiate but such as *consented to the gospel and took the profession thereof upon them*."‡

* Ib. pp. 327, 8. † Strype's Ann. I. I. 223.
‡ Ib. p. 329.

And in his Life of Archbishop Parker, he introduces this Declaration, (which, by the way, he there dates April, 1561,) with the following important remark,—"*In the Church many popishly affected priests still kept their hold by their outward compliances; but to make the best provision that could be against such for all times hereafter, all parsons, vicars, and curates that took ecclesiastical livings or cures were now bound to make a public declaration, by the order of the Archbishop and the rest of the Bishops, and afterwards to be read by them once every half-year before their people, to testify their common consent in certain sound doctrines. That hereby Papists might be refuted, who had slandered the Protestant ministers, as if there were no agreement and unity of faith among them.*"*

The object of the Reformers evidently was to proceed gradually and with caution, while they secured the ultimate attainment of the end they had in view, namely, the purgation of the Church, as Strype says, from "Popish errors and superstitions." Their views in this respect are thus stated by Strype: after noticing some advice that had been given by the martyr John Rogers during the reign of Mary, to one of his fellow-sufferers, in the prospect of a subsequent change of circumstances, he adds,—"This advice in part was now followed by the guides of the Church, by appointing readers for the churches; but the method they thought too violent to turn out all the former priests, especially being willing to conform themselves. *For this would make too great a devastation in the Church. And they hoped by time and better information, even these priests might come to be hearty embracers of the Reformation, and serviceable to it.*"†

These words are remarkable as showing the reasons the Reformers had for proceeding in the cautious way they did, and the object they had in view in tolerating for a time the retention of men in the Church, who, while willing to officiate according to the Reformed Liturgy, might still be inclined in some points to Roman doctrine.

* Strype's Parker, I 131, 2. † Ann. I. I. 267.

But they took effectual means to prevent their *teaching* their errors. For as Strype informs us, after noticing the "Declaration" just given, "Near about this time also (unless it were the year before) another thing was drawn up by the Archbishop for the *practice* of the clergy, as the former was for them to *declare*, entitled, 'Resolutions and Orders taken by common consent of the bishops for this present time, until a synod may be had, &c.'" And the first of these "Orders" is, "That the licenses given for preaching by the late Visitors general be *no longer in force*. And that such as hereafter shall be admitted to preach shall be diligently examined, as well in *unity of doctrine established by public authority*, as admonished to use sobriety and discretion in teaching the people," &c.*

It is clear, then, that none were allowed to preach but those of whose orthodoxy the authorities of the Church were satisfied. And who those were, we may learn from a speech of Lord Mountague, a Romanist, in the House of Lords, in 1562; who says,—"It is sufficient and enough for Protestants, to keep the possession of the churches, and *the authority to preach* and excommunicate, not to seek to force and strain men to do or believe by compulsion that they believe not."†

Such were the precautions taken by our Reformers in matters of doctrine previous to the Convocation at which the Thirty-nine Articles were passed as the standard of our Church's faith. Can we recognize, then, in these proceedings anything of that spirit of "neutrality" between Protestantism and Romanism by which Mr. Oakeley tells us they were guided?

At the meeting of Convocation at the latter end of 1562, the Thirty-nine Articles were agreed upon; the Convocational subscription to them being made in Feb. 1562-3.

And before we proceed to the particular consideration of them, I would observe, that as, in the case of the former Articles, subscription was not required immediately from all the clergy, so with these the members of Convocation only were called upon to subscribe them at the time. It appears, indeed, from the

* Ann. I. I. 329. † Strype's Ann. I. I. 443.

Acts of this Convocation,* that many of the clergy wished that they should be immediately enforced throughout the kingdom; and, as we shall have occasion to notice hereafter, four years after this the matter of subscription was mooted in the House of Commons, and a petition presented by the bishops to the Queen, begging her to favour the measure; from which we may see, that the forbearance exercised towards popishly affected ministers in possession of benefices was only intended to be temporary: but (probably through the reluctance of the Queen) nothing was done in the matter till the year 1571.

Consequently it is perfectly true, that, *so far as the Thirty-Nine Articles were concerned*, persons attached to Romish doctrines might remain in the ministry of the Church, *because they were not called upon to declare their assent to them*, prudential reasons causing a sufferance *for a time* of those who could not conscientiously subscribe them. But this forms no ground of defence for one who subscribes them while holding Romish doctrines. The question, it must be remembered, is not, whether men suspected of holding Roman doctrine, or even professing to hold it, were *ever* permitted, for a time, under certain circumstances, to minister in our Church without subscribing the Articles; but, whether an avowed adherence to Roman doctrine is consistent with the obligations NOW imposed upon the ministers of that Church, when all are required to subscribe the Articles. And the very fact that (either from tenderness or policy) subscription was not, for a time, universally pressed upon all those in possession of benefices at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, but only upon those who should be newly admitted to them, shows, when we remember that the former had all been Romanists, what the doctrine of the Articles was considered to be by those who promulged them.

We thus see the error of the statement, that "after the revision of 1562 they [i. e. the Articles] were enforced, but as it appears against Non-conformists and not Roman Catholics." They were not in fact enforced, that is the clergy generally were not called upon to subscribe them, until 1571, when an

* See Wilk. Concil. iv. 241.

Act of Parliament passed requiring all the clergy to subscribe them. And, as we have already noticed, the passage quoted from Fuller in support of this assertion has been taken out of its context to adapt it to that purpose, for it occurs under the year 1571, and *follows* the passage which the pamphlet *places after* it. Moreover, when enforced, all consistent Romanists had quitted the Church, Elizabeth having been excommunicated by the Pope two years before; so that *one* object of their being enforced then might be to defend the Church from other errors, but this was not the exclusive object, as I shall show hereafter. The Act had the purgation of the Church from Roman doctrine quite as much in view as its purgation from other errors. And the zeal of the House of Commons in the matter clearly shows to any one acquainted with the history of those times that such was the case.

A singular argument of Mr. Oakeley's upon this subject is derived from the lenieney displayed towards the Romanists, as far as direct punishment was concerned, in the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign. What this can have to do with the question of the character of the 39 Articles, and the obligations imposed upon those who were allowed to *minister* in the Church, it is difficult to understand. But as the argument is pressed, it may be well to meet it.

It is quite true, then, as Mr. Oakeley maintains (page 30) from a passage in Lord Burghley's tract entitled, "The Execution of Justice in England," that the *seditious* acts of the Romanists made them traitors, not their *books*, nor their beads, &c. Not but what these things were prohibited, for they were expressly forbidden by Act of Parliament; * but none *suffered* on account of them. And so again, as he asserts from a passage in the "Important Considerations," none were pressed by the Queen to her sect, or to the denial of their faith; none were vexed simply for that he was either priest or catholic. No; Romanists were not punished for their private opinions. All that was required was outward conformity to the laws. No inquisition into their tenets was made, as in

* 13 Eliz. c. 2. Gibs. Cod. i. 531, and Strype's Whitgift, i. 512, 13. (269 m.

Queen Mary's time. Even after her excommunication by the Pope, followed by rebellions among her subjects, the Queen, in 1570, issued a Proclamation, given by Strype with these remarks,—" Yet notwithstanding these bold and exorbitant practices of papists, they did even at this time receive a notable piece of favour, to gain them, if possible, to be better minded, and to behave themselves quietly, as well as to clear the Queen of false reports. It was this: ' That the Queen would not have any of their consciences unnecessarily sifted, to know what affection they had to *the old religion.*' Which was in effect to allow them their religion to themselves, if they would but be quiet, and make no disturbances about it in the state. And for the better certifying all persons of it, the lord keeper had an order to declare as much in the Star-chamber. And this matter was drawn up by the Secretary, to be published by the said lord keeper in the said court on the 15th of June, in these words: ' Whereas certain rumours are carried and spread abroad among sundry her Majesty's subjects, that her Majesty hath caused, or will hereafter cause, inquisition and examination to be had of men's consciences in matters of religion; her Majesty would have it known, that such reports are utterly untrue, and grounded either of malice, or of some fear more than there is cause. For although certain persons have been lately convented before her Majesty's Council upon just causes, and that some of them have been treated withal upon some matter of religion, yet the cause thereof hath grown merely of themselves; in that they have first manifestly *broken the laws established for religion, in not coming at all to the Church, to common prayer, and divine service*, as of late time before they were accustomed, and had used by the space of nine or ten whole years together; so as if thereby they had not given manifest occasion by their open and wilful contempt of breaking of her Majesty's laws, they had not been anything molested, or dealt withal. Wherefore her Majesty would have all her loving subjects to understand, that, as long as they shall openly continue in the observation of her laws, and shall not wilfully and manifestly break them by their open actions, her Majesty's meaning

is, not to have any of them molested *by any inquisition or examination of their consciences in causes of religion*; but will accept and entreat them as her good and obedient subjects." *

From this document we may clearly see the nature and *limits* of the toleration then granted to the Romanists. Outward compliance with "the laws established for religion" was required of them; but no inquiry was made as to the doctrines they held.

But are we to conclude hence that the standards of doctrine of the Church of England may be interpreted so as to be consistent with the doctrine of the Church of Rome? It is difficult to see what connexion there is between the premises and the conclusion. Rather do not the very statements themselves in which these concessions are made show the *contrariety* between the doctrines of the two churches? What, moreover, says Lord Burghley in the very Tract Mr. Oakeley quotes from?—"And though there are many subjects known in the realm, that *differ in some opinions of religion from the Church of England*, and that do also not forbear to *profess the same*, yet in that they do also profess loyalty and obedience to her Majesty, and offer readily in her Majesty's defence to impugn and resist any foreign force, though it should come or be procured from the Pope himself, none of these sort are for their *contrary opinions in religion* prosecuted or charged with any crimes or pains of treason, nor yet willingly searched in their consciences for their contrary opinions, that savour not of treason." And he proceeds to mention some by name, noticing first Dr. Heth, Archbishop of York on Queen Elizabeth's accession, of whom he speaks as "*in religion manifestly differing*." And he goes on to say, "so as it may plainly appear, that it is not, nor hath been for *contrarious opinions in religion, or* for the Pope's authority, as the adversaries do boldly and falsely publish, that any persons have suffered death since

* Strype's Ann. ch. 57, I. 2, 370—372.

her Majesty's reign, and yet some of these sort are well known to hold opinion that the Pope ought by authority of God's word to be supreme and only Head of the Catholic Church, and only to rule in all causes ecclesiastical, and that the Queen's Majesty ought not to be the Governor over all her subjects in her realm being persons ecclesiastical: *Which opinions are nevertheless in some part by the laws of the realm punishable in some degrees*, and yet for none of these points have any persons been prosecuted with the charge of treason, or in danger of life. And if, then, it be inquired, for what cause these others have of late suffered death, it is truly to be answered as afore is often remembered, that none at all are impeached for treason to the danger of their life, but such as do obstinately maintain the contents of the Pope's Bull afore-mentioned, which do import, that her Majesty is not the lawful Queen of England," &c. &c.*

Remarkable also are the words that *follow* those quoted by Mr. Oakeley from the "Important Considerations." "*Some* there were," say the Jesuits addressing Queen Elizabeth, "that to *please and gratify you*, went to your churches."† As if this was all they would grant that any real Romanists did. Indeed the very words quoted are sufficient to overthrow the hypothesis in support of which they are adduced; for if all Roman doctrine might be held consistently with the doctrinal standards of the Church of England, the Romanists might have joined Queen Elizabeth's "sect," without any "denial of their faith."

It is clear, then, that such passages as those quoted in the work under review, do not in the least indicate any conformity in the doctrines of the Church of England to those of Rome; still less afford any proof that men attached to Romish doctrines might consistently remain in the ministry of the Church of England; but only show that a certain degree of toleration was granted to those who did not openly offend against the laws.

* See the reprint of this treatise in "A Collection of several Treatises concerning the Reasons and Occasions of the Penal Laws." Lond. 1668, 4to. p. 6, 7, 8.

† Ib. p. 35.

But Mr. Oakeley seems quite unconscious of the real nature of the toleration thus shown to the Romanists, for he tells us that his position that "the Articles never were urged or felt as a ground of disunion between the Churches" is "attested by the plea upon which the penal enactments carried out from time to time in this country against Roman Catholics have always been defended, viz. that they were enforced upon merely civil, and in nowise upon religious grounds," (pp. 30, 31.) Now certainly no one was put to death, or, perhaps, punished, merely for holding Roman doctrines. No inquiry was made as to the private opinions of individuals, until sentiments were broached of a directly treasonable nature. None were called upon to subscribe the Articles but the clergy, and there were therefore no penal enactments for a refusal to subscribe. But surely Mr. Oakeley must be aware that there were certain "laws established for religion" (to use the language of the Proclamation), and that non-compliance with those laws was punishable by fine and imprisonment, and that *Romanists complained of those laws as requiring them to join in services opposed to the doctrines of their Church.* And though in a certain sense the penalties might be said (in the language of that period) to be enforced on civil and not religious grounds, i. e. as a penalty for disobedience to what had been enjoined by the State, and for the absence of outward compliance with the law, (which was all that was required,) the words could not be used in any sense that implied an agreement between the Protestant and Roman doctrine. The Act for Uniformity in 1559 inflicted a penalty on all who did not attend the service of the Church; also upon all who spoke against the Book of Common Prayer; and, still further, upon all who *said* or *heard* mass.* And by 5 Eliz. c. 23, it appears that a writ *de excomm. cap.* might issue on the ground of "refusing to have his or their child baptized, or to receive the holy communion as it is now commonly used to be received in the Church of England, or to come to Divine service, now

* Gibson's Codex, i. 268, note *r*, and 269, note *b*.

commonly used in the said Church of England, or *error in matters of religion or doctrine now received and allowed in the said Church of England* . . . . . or *idolatry*." *

And these enactments were put in force against the Romanists. August 8, 1562, Strype tells us, "a priest was taken in Fenter-lane at a certain lady's house, singing of mass; and with his cope which he had on, he was carried through London to the Lord Mayor's; and after, from thence to the Compter; and some days after removed to the Marshalsea, where popish priests were now commonly committed." "Feb. the 2nd being Candlemas-day, in devotion to the blessed Virgin Mary, certain men and women went to Durham-place, and others to St. Mary Spital, to hear mass. But many of them were taken, and carried away with the guard, and others sent to the Compter and other places. Such strict care was now taken, that no popish superstition, or any other divine service should be used but that lately established by Act of Parliament."†

Among Archbishop Grindal's Letters also are two or three which will illustrate this matter. In one (written Aug. 1563) to Lord Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester, who had interceded for one Sebastian Westcote, a minor canon of St. Paul's, Grindal, then Bishop of London, says that he had been complained of in his Visitation for "utterly abstaining from the communion," and adds, "I also one day conferred with him myself: and perceiving that he sticked much at the matter of *transubstantiation*, I showed him testimonies not only of the Scriptures, but also of the old Fathers, most evidently against *that error;* and gave him then time to think upon the matter. But all in vain. And therefore I was at length compelled to pronounce him excommunicate, who afore in doings had excommunicated himself."‡ In another letter, to Sir W. Cecil (July, 1563), he says respecting a Sir Thomas Fitzharbert, we "concluded to let Mr. Fitzharbert be abroad upon sureties, *if he would be bound in the mean time to go orderly to the*

* Gibson's Codex, ii. 1058. † Strype's Ann. ch. 32. I. 1. 545, 6.
‡ Grindal's Works, Park. Soc. ed. p. 262.

church, without binding him to receive the communion. That Sir Thomas refused."* And again, to the Lords of the Privy Council who had placed under his charge one Michael Hare, Esq., *a papist*, that he might "deal with him to bring him to *conformity in the religion established*," † he writes (Jan. 1569) "It may please your good Lordships to be advertised, that Michael Hare, Esq., by order from your Lordships, hath remained in my house sithence the 15th of November last, in which time I have conferred and travailed with him, (as my other businesses would permit me,) to persuade him to resort to common prayer, to communicate with us in the Lord's Supper, and *generally to assent to all points of godly religion by law established in this realm*. Notwithstanding, finding the said Mr. Hare in all other matters very courteous and tractable, I cannot yet persuade him hereunto, alleging that he is not yet satisfied in conscience, and that for conscience sake only he doth forbear so to do, and not of malice. The principal ground whereon he most stayeth himself in all conferences is the long continuance of *the contrary religion*, in the times that have gone before; notwithstanding sundry allegations by me made, and divers authorities showed, that the most ancient times agree with us." ‡

There is ample evidence, then, (and it would be easy to add to it,) as to the views of that period on the relative character of Church of England and Roman doctrine; and the way in which non-conforming Romanists were dealt with.

And to settle this whole matter beyond dispute, we will close our remarks upon it with an extract from an Act of Parliament, 23 Eliz. c. 1. (A. 1580), in which it is enacted, that all persons who shall attempt to "withdraw any of the Queen's Majesty's subjects . . . . from their natural obedience to her Majesty; or to withdraw them, for that intent, FROM THE RELIGION NOW BY HER HIGHNESS AUTHORITY ESTABLISHED WITHIN HER HIGHNESS DOMINIONS TO THE ROMISH RELIGION, or to move them or any of them to promise any obedience to any pre-

* Ib. 274. † Strype's Grindal, 223 (151 m.)

‡ Grindal's Works, p. 320.

tended authority of the See of Rome . . . . shall be to all intents adjudged to be traitors," &c. &c.*

Mr. Oakeley tells us, that the use of the term "recusant," as applied to the Romanists, fixes the date of their separation from the national Church, and makes it posterior to the year 1569.† After the evidence already adduced of the secession of the Romanists from the *ministry*, and even to a considerable extent from the *communion*, of our Church, long before that period, it is hardly necessary to say, that even *if* this *term* had not been previously used, such a fact would not have altered the state of the case. But the truth is, the term was used long before; certainly as early as the year 1561, as appears from a document of that date given by Strype; and therefore, according to Mr. Oakeley's own showing, the separation took place as early as that year. The document is a list of persons attached to the Romish religion, principally of the clergy, headed, "RECUSANTS which are abroad, and bound to certain places." It is introduced by Strype with the following remarks,—"Such as bore affection to the old popish religion were now very busy about the kingdom, to disaffect the minds of the Queen's subjects. These were *both of the laity, and of the clergy, and of the universities*, whom it was therefore thought necessary to watch diligently . . . . . And many were about this time brought before the ecclesiastical commissioners; from whom yet they received favourable handling, for they did not put or continue them in prison, nor prosecute the law upon them . . . . And thus they might have lived and died here safely and securely, as several did; but many, or most, acted by a turbulent spirit, soon after this fled away beyond the seas . . . . I have met with a particular list of the names of these men, whether deans, archdeacons, prebendaries, beneficed priests, scholars in the universities, &c. . . . . and another list of the names of such who were known to be dangerous persons, but not taken; also a third, of the names of such as were fled, and a fourth of such as were in hold." ‡

* Gibson's Codex, i. 536 † See pp. 11, 12, above.
‡ Ann. ch. 24, I. i. 410, 11.

As it respects the oath of supremacy which Mr. Oakeley says was no bar before 1569 to civil, far less to ecclesiastical privileges, being understood by the majority as a mere test of loyalty, it is notorious that (to mention no others) it was refused by all the bishops but one. There is no doubt, certainly, that many took it who held many points of Roman doctrine, but it is equally clear that by the leading men among the Romanists it was refused. But the matter is wholly immaterial to our present subject, and therefore it is not worth while to pursue it further.

But it is stated, that "it further appears, that many members of the Lower House of Convocation, who were Roman Catholics, subscribed the Articles upon the revision in 1562." And the authority for this statement is as follows,—"Strype gives their names, and among them we find that of the celebrated John Bridgewater," &c. &c. (p. 30. See p. 11 above.)

Now this is altogether a mistake; the statement of Strype is this,—"It may not be amiss," he says, "in the perusing these names, [that is, the subscribers to the Articles in the Lower House,] to show which of them had been exiles under Queen Mary, and who, though not exiles, yet lived then obscurely; and who, lastly, in that reign, complied with the popish religion, and were dignified in the Church." And then, having noticed the names of the first two sorts, he adds,—"Those of this synod that were in place and dignity under Queen Mary were Thomas White; (who is mentioned in a letter of Bishop Grindal's, writ soon after this synod to the secretary, as a great papist, and yet at the synod; and I find that Gregory Martin, of Rheims, wrote, anno 1575, to one Dr. Tho. White, Warden of New College, who I conclude was this our White, reproving him for '*following the world, or dissembling in religion against his conscience and knowledge*;') he was Archdeacon of Berks, 1557, Chancellor of Sarum, 1571, and died 1588. Besides this White, of the same sort, were Andrew Perne, Francis Mallet, (who was Queen Mary's chaplain, and nominated by her to the Pope, a little before her death, for

bishop of Sarum,) Cottrel, Turnbul, (who was prebend of Canterbury,) and divers others.

"Let me make a brief note or two of *a few more members of this synod*, as I might of many more of them, were this a place for it. John Bridgwater was rector of Lincoln College, in Oxford, and after divers years went over sea, and took several young men along with him, *and turned papist*."*

Now the only person here mentioned of whom there seems any evidence that he was a papist, is Thomas White; for, of the rest it is only stated that they were "in place and dignity under Queen Mary;" and he, it appears, for retaining his place in the Church of England, was called to account by a Romanist for "*following the world or dissembling in religion against his conscience and knowledge*," that is, in short, for having either gone over to Protestantism or pretended to have done so; the best possible proof we could have, that if any holding Roman doctrine remained in the ministry of the Church of England, they were obliged to use *dissimulation* to do so; so that if we put down all here mentioned as having been "in place and dignity under Queen Mary," as Romanists in heart, this will not help out Mr. Oakeley at all; and in fact this very passage of Strype affords the best possible evidence against the hypothesis we are combating. And as it respects John Bridgwater, he is *not* mentioned as one who even *had* been a papist, but as one who *afterwards* "turned" papist, and *then quitted* the Church of England. And we may add, that in the work he published after turning papist, entitled, "Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ in Anglia adversus Calvinopapistas et Puritanos," he throughout speaks of the clergy of the Church of England, whom he calls "Calvinopapistas," (their title to the latter part of this name being derived from their retaining the Episcopal form of Church Government instead of adopting the Presbyterian), as *heretics*.

So far, then, from there being any evidence here, that any *professing* to hold Roman doctrine subscribed the Articles, there

* Annals ch. 28. I. 1. 491, 2.

is, on the contrary, evidence that any such subscription could only have been made by the subscriber *dissembling* his real sentiments.

The passage of Heylin, upon which (and upon which *alone*) Mr. Oakeley grounds his assertion, that the Articles were remodelled by Archbishop Parker and his coadjutors "with a studied reference to the views of those who retained their prepossessions in favour of the old religion," states nothing more than that their "moderation" was "visible in declining all unnecessary determinations," and in "not separating further from the Church of Rome than that Church had separated from what she was in her purest times," (which is all the separation Protestants desire,) and that "possibly" some who subscribed the Articles in the Lower House of Convocation were "inclined rather to the old religion;" all which may readily be granted without affording any help to Mr. Oakeley's hypothesis. In fact, the passages already quoted from Heylin* show that in this passage he has no meaning such as Mr Oakeley has attributed to him.

It is also urged, that the Articles were "presented again and again to the members of Convocation until all or nearly all had subscribed them;" and hence the conclusion is deduced, that the imposers of the Articles "took the best means in their power to overcome the scruple" of those who objected to them, instead of at once ejecting them on their first hesitation. Surely the very fact of their wishing to avoid subscription goes against Mr. Oakeley's hypothesis; and our reformers were not accustomed to act in the summary way here suggested, by turning men out on the first appearance of hesitation in complying with their requisitions. They gave time for consideration. But as to their taking "the best means in their power to overcome the scruple," and "acting in a Catholic spirit towards the representatives of the ancient faith," it is difficult to know to what these words refer. The course they *did* take, is thus described by Heylin. After noticing the continued demur on the part of "many" in the Lower House to subscribe, even after an order

* See p. 21 above.

for subscription had been issued by the Upper House on account of previous delay in the matter, he adds,—"An order thereupon is made by their Lordships, on the 10th then following, that the prolocutor should return the names of all such persons who refused subscription, *to the end that such further course might be taken with them as to their Lordships should seem most fit.*"* That is, they were either to subscribe or be brought before the High Commissioners. Is such subscription, then, by a few individuals, (supposing the fact, which is not proved, that they did hold the doctrine of the Church of Rome,) any evidence that there is no inconsistency between the two?

Did all the subscribers in King Edward's days hold the doctrine they subscribed? What was the confession of one of the principal of them, Dr. Weston, afterwards? In the Disputation with Ridley at Oxford, referring to the Catechism, commonly called King Edward's Catechism, he complains to Ridley, "You made me subscribe to it, when you were a bishop in your ruff;" which, though Ridley denied it, shows with what views Dr. Weston subscribed.†

And there was no difficulty in obtaining a dispensation for such subscription, if it was supposed that the interests of the Church of Rome would be promoted by it. Among some state papers, which came into the hands of Archbishop Usher, and from him to the eminent antiquary Sir James Ware, and were published by his son, Robert Ware,‡ is one (reprinted by Strype) from an agent of Cecil's in Italy, in 1564, in which the writer states that among various expedients devised by a Council at Rome, appointed by the Pope to arrange such matters, it had been determined, that "for the better assurance of further intelligence to the See of Rome, licenses were to be given to dispense with several baptisms, marriages, and other ceremonies of the Church of England, to possess and enjoy any offices, either ecclesiastical, military, or civil; *to take such oaths as should be imposed upon them*, provided that the same

* Hist. of Reform. Eliz. p. 159. † Ridley's Works, Park. Soc. ed. p. 226.
‡ In "Foxes and Firebrands."

oaths be taken with a reserve for to serve the mother Church of Rome, whenever opportunity served;" also "the See of Rome to *dispense with all parties of the Roman faith to swear to all heresies in England and elsewhere;* and that not to be a crime against the soul of the party; the accused taking the oath with an intention to promote or advance the Roman Catholic faith."*

It is easy, then, to account for there being *some* subscribers among the adherents of a religion in which such things were tolerated.

Nor should it be forgotten, that those who subscribed the Articles in Convocation, subscribed the 28th with the clause that was in the Articles of 1552, but was omitted in our present Articles before they were authorized by Queen Elizabeth;† and therefore subscribed expressly and in terms against "the real and bodily" presence of Christ in the Eucharist; which shows, that if any Romanists subscribed them, they were only such Romanists as were ready to subscribe anything rather than give up their places in the Church, for here the very term "real presence" is rejected.

There remains, I believe, but one of Mr. Oakeley's authorities to meet, namely, his reference (p. 29) to Strype's Grindal, p. 98 [97], from which he quotes thus,—"Of the subscribers (to Queen Elizabeth's injunctions for conformity) . . . . there were many, who had said mass in Queen Mary's time, and such as would not change their custom of old Paternoster." Now the fact is, that the subscription required was not, as is here represented, to Queen Elizabeth's injunctions, (though even that would prove nothing respecting the 39 Articles,) but merely a subscription promising to observe an order that had been issued for the use of the cap, tippet, gown and surplice; to which of course the papists would be far from objecting. This is distinctly stated in the context of the passage cited from Strype.

* Strype's Ann. ch. 36. I. 2. 56, 7.

† See Burnet's Expos. of the Articles, on Art. 28; and Grindal's Works, Lett. to Cecil, July 17, 1563, p. 257.

Mr. Oakeley's proofs, then, altogether fail him, when examined. What he has to show is, that Roman doctrine was held by ministers of the Church of England openly and avowedly, and with the sanction of the authorities of the Church, after subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles; while on the contrary the utmost that can be proved, is, that after a most extensive secession from the ministry had taken place in consequence of the introduction of the Prayer-book, and various steps had been taken gradually to purge the Church from Popish errors and superstitions, a few persons *suspected* of holding Romish doctrines were in the Convocation of 1562, and, after trying to avoid subscription to the Articles, and being threatened by the bishops with further proceedings if they refused, did ultimately subscribe. And these persons were accused by the Romanists, (for the charge made against one applies to all,) of either following the world or *dissembling* against their conscience in remaining in the Church of England.

Having thus shown, not merely the absence of all evidence in favour of Mr. Oakeley's position, but that there is ample evidence against it, in the general history of the rise and progress of the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth, let us proceed to consider more particularly the history of the Articles themselves, as remodelled at this period.

Among the documents given by Strype is one entitled, "General Notes of Matters to be moved by the Clergy in the next Parliament and Synod." The author of it is not known, but the paper contains marginal notes by Archbishop Parker himself and others. Among these notes occurs the following,— "Certain articles, containing the principal grounds of Christian religion, are to be set forth, (*in the which also is to be determined the truth of those things which in this age are called into controversy*,) much like to such Articles as were set forth a little before the death of King Edward. Of which Articles the most part may be used with addition and correction, as shall be thought convenient." *

* Strype's Ann. ch. 27. I. 1. 474.

This throws some light, then, on the *intentions* of some leading men, engaged in this matter, *previous* to the Synod or Convocation at which the Articles were agreed upon.

At the Convocation, in 1562, one of the Petitions of the Lower House of Convocation to the Upper was,—"That certain Articles, containing the principal grounds of Christian religion, be set forth, as well to *determine the truth of things this day in controversy*, as also *to show what errors are chiefly to be eschewed.*"*

This, again, shows the wishes of the Lower House; and that it was quite against their view to maintain a neutrality in the Articles on the points then in question between the Romanists and the Protestants. And this fact is of great importance, because in the Lower House alone could there be any *possibility* of Romish counsels entering.

Proceeding to the Articles themselves, we find them almost a repetition of those drawn up in 1552; and which, as we have already seen, formed one principal ground of Cranmer's condemnation, being pronounced by the University of Oxford to be "*heretical, impious, and execrable.*" And, to the complete overthrow of Mr. Oakeley's hypothesis, the alterations made were all of them, with one exception, *indisputably* in a Protestant direction. I say, with one exception, because though the words substituted in 1562 are clearly enough opposed to the Roman doctrine, and do in fact, as Bishop Burnet says, "amount to the same thing," there was an omission of a dogmatic statement against the Romish doctrine on the subject, containing a somewhat more precise definition on one point than the clause substituted for it; an omission made probably at the instance of the Queen, whose views on that point were at first, it seems, not so clear or decided as were those of her divines.

The exception is in the Article on the Lord's Supper, in which, in the Articles of 1552, occurred the following clause: "For as much as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one and the self same man cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place,

* Ib. ch. 30. I. 1. 508. Wilk. Conc. iv. 240

therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places: and because, as Holy Scripture doth teach, Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly confess *the real and bodily* (*corporalem*) presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." This clause was omitted in 1562; and a similar one in the Prayer-book of 1552 (in the rubric at the end of the Communion Service) denying any "*real and essential* presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" in the Eucharist, had been omitted in the Prayer-book of 1559.

But then, in the place of the clause omitted, was inserted the following, directly opposed to the doctrine of the Church of Rome as laid down previously at the Council of Trent. "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." The alteration was not made in Convocation, for the Articles were signed by both Houses of Convocation with the clause of 1552 in them, but by the direction of the Queen or her Council. And the account of this matter by Bishop Burnet is as follows,—"When these Articles," he says, "were at first prepared by the Convocation in Queen Elizabeth's reign, this paragraph was made a part of them; for the original subscription by both Houses of Convocation, yet extant, shows this. But the design of the Government was at that time much turned to the drawing over the body of the nation to the Reformation, in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament; therefore it was thought not expedient to offend them by so particular a definition in this matter, in which the very word *real presence* was rejected. It might perhaps be also suggested, that here a definition was made that went too much upon the principles of natural philosophy; which how true soever, they might not be the proper subject of an Article of religion. Therefore it was thought fit to suppress this paragraph; though it was a part of the Article that was subscribed,

yet it was not published, but the paragraph that follows, *The body of Christ, &c.* was put in its stead, and was received and published by the next Convocation; which upon the matter was a full explanation of the way of Christ's presence in this sacrament; that *he is present in a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that faith is the mean by which he is received.* This seemed to be more theological, and it *does indeed amount to the same thing.* But howsoever we see what was the sense of the first Convocation in Queen Elizabeth's reign; it differed in nothing from that in King Edward's time. And therefore though this paragraph is now no part of our Articles, yet we are certain that the clergy at that time did not at all doubt of the truth of it; we are sure it was their opinion, since they subscribed it, though they did not think fit to publish it, at first; and though it was afterwards changed for another, that was *the same in sense.*"*

And so far as Mr. Oakeley or any of the clergy of the present day are concerned, the alteration, whatever its import, would make no difference, because the rubric, which is *much stronger than the clause in the Article,* was restored in the Prayer-book at the review in 1662, with only this change, that the word "*corporal*" (the very word that had been used in the Article,) was inserted in place of the words "*real and essential.*" I am quite aware that this change has been pressed into their service by Mr. Oakeley and others. But, not to mention the context, asserting that the "sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances," and that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here," (expressions clearly condemnatory of the Roman doctrine,) the fact is, that the doctrine *as thus expressed* was one of the principal things for which Cranmer suffered; for he is charged with maintaining "inter cetera Christum in Eucharistia spiritualiter tantùm et *non corporaliter* esse, sed in corpore in celo tantum esse, et non alibi."† Were it necessary, it would be easy to bring additional proof that the

* Burnet's Expos. of the Articles, on Art. 28.

† Strype's Cranmer, Oxf. ed. vol. 2 p. 1075.

phrase "corporal presence" is the proper and authorized phrase for the Roman doctrine; and the word was substituted for the words "real and essential," because, as Archbishop Tenison tells us,* the latter were "subject to misconstruction." They might be applied to a spiritual and sacramental presence, and therefore a more definite and precise term was preferred. Thus Cranmer in the disputation at Oxford says,—"If ye understand by this word 'really' 're ipsa,' i. e. in very deed and effectually, so Christ by the grace and efficacy of his passion is indeed and truly present to all his true and holy members. But if ye understand by this word 'really' 'corporaliter,' i. e. 'corporally,' so that by the body of Christ is understood a natural body and organical, so the first proposition doth vary, not only from the usual speech and phrase of Scripture, but also is clean contrary to the holy word of God and Christian profession." † And the latter was what was contended for in this disputation by the Romanists.

Hence supposing any advantage to accrue to the Romish party on this particular point by the alteration made in this respect in the time of Queen Elizabeth, (and little enough it could be, as it left the protests against transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, &c. precisely what they were before,) the change cannot be of any avail now to those who hold Roman doctrine, because the rubric has been re-inserted in the Prayer-book. As it respects the phraseology of the rubric, we shall make some further remarks, when we come to notice, in its proper place, its re-insertion in 1662.

We should observe also, while noticing the alterations introduced at the revision in 1562, that in the Article against purgatory, indulgences, &c., the phrase, "the doctrine of the school authors," used respecting them in 1552, is changed into "the Romish doctrine," which, notwithstanding any attempts to explain it away, any impartial reader will, I believe, consider as intended to express "the doctrine of the Church of Rome." It is quite true, that the session of the Council of Trent in which its decrees respecting purgatory, indulgences, worship-

* On Idolatry, p. 181.

† Fox's Acts and Mon. vol. vi. p. 446.

ping of relics and images, and invocation of saints were laid down, was posterior to the revision of the Articles; the latter being in Jan. 1562-3, and the former in Dec. 1563. But not only was there sufficient evidence what the doctrine of the Church of Rome was upon those subjects from other sources, but in fact as to purgatory,* indulgences,† and invocation of saints,‡ these doctrines had been distinctly recognized in various sessions of the Council that had *preceded* the revision of the Articles. Indeed out of the twenty-five sessions of the Council, the decrees of sixteen (including the doctrines of Scripture and tradition, original sin, justification and good works, the sacraments, baptism, the Lord's supper, &c.) were well known here before the Articles were originally drawn up in 1552; and the decrees of twenty-two must have been well known here before the revision in Jan. 1562-3, the twenty-second session having taken place in September, 1562, four months previous. And the only matters connected with our present subject discussed in the remaining three sessions were, the sacraments of order and matrimony and the points above mentioned. So utterly incorrect is the assertion that "the decrees of Trent were drawn up after the Articles."§

This change of phrase bears strongly against Mr. Oakeley's hypothesis, not only as affecting the phraseology of the Articles, but as showing the *object* of the Reformers to be precisely contrary to what he has asserted. And if it were necessary to add one word more to fix the meaning of the phrase "the Romish doctrine," we may observe, that upon the revision of the Articles in 1571, previous to their general subscription, seven years after the conclusion of the Council of Trent, this phrase was retained; which, had it applied to anything different from the doctrine as ultimately laid down in the Council, would, of course, not have been the case.

Further; the *object* for which the Articles were put forth was, *to produce unity of doctrine in the church in the great points then controverted*; a fact, which stamps the hypothesis

* Sess. vi. can. 30. sess. xxii. c. 2. † Sess. xxi. c. 9. ‡ Sess. xxii. c. 3.
§ Lett. to Dr. Jelf, pp. 6 & 19.

of Mr. Newman and Mr. Oakeley with palpable absurdity ; for that hypothesis supposes that the Articles were intentionally so worded as to give no definite decision on the points at issue between the Protestants and the Romanists ; the differences between the two being, nevertheless, according to Mr. Oakeley himself (p. 38), "*fundamental* and *irreconcileable*."

That such was the object, is evident, first, from the very title prefixed to the Articles; "Articuli de quibus convenit &c. *ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem, et consensum in vera religione firmandum ;*" or, as in the English edition, "Articles agreed upon &c. *for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion.*" Can words more clearly show, that it was the intention of those who put forth those Articles, that they should supply a definite decision on the great points then in controversy ? There was no doubt a wise moderation observed, as Dr. Heylin remarks, in not stuffing the Articles with unnecessary theological determinations on all controverted points, *a moderation which I for my part trust that the Church of England will ever observe*, but such a position as that of Mr. Newman and Mr. Oakeley would thoroughly stultify those who put them forth with the title they bear.

And that this was the general object of our Reformers in all their proceedings, that is, to produce *gradually* unity of doctrine in the church, on all points of primary importance, we have abundant testimony from other sources. Thus in the "Declaration" (already quoted*), drawn up in 1560, to be signed by all newly inducted into cures, the articles contained therein are said to be put forth "for the unity of doctrine to be taught and holden of all parsons, vicars and curates ; as well in testification of their common consent in the said doctrines to the stopping of the mouths of them that go about to slander the ministry of the church for diversity of judgment, as necessary for the instruction of their people." And in the "Orders" put forth about this time, according to Strype, by the bishops, the first is, "that the licenses given for preaching by the late

* See p. 54 above.

Visitors general be no longer in force; and that such as hereafter shall be admitted to preach shall be diligently examined, as well *in unity of doctrine established by public authority*, as admonished to use sobriety and discretion in teaching the people," &c.*

And among articles of inquiry at episcopal Visitations, a prominent one is, as to uniformity of doctrine being maintained *according to the laws put forth on that behalf*, and whether *any popish errors* are taught. Thus in Archbishop Parker's Metropolitical Visitation Articles, for the cathedral and collegiate churches of his Province, given by Strype both under the years 1560 and 1567,† and by Wilkins under the latter date,‡ the sixth is,—" You shall inquire of *the doctrine and judgment* of all and singular head and members of your church . . . . whether any of them do *either privily or openly* preach or teach any *unwholesome, erroneous* or seditious doctrine; or discourage any man, soberly for his edifying, from the reading of the Holy Scripture; or *in any other point do persuade any not to conform themselves to the order of religion reformed, restored and received by public authority in this Church of England.* As for example;"§ &c. And then follow several *popish* doctrines, as purgatory, &c., as we have already seen.‖

And in his Visitation Articles for his Diocese in 1569 the 25th is, " Whether any your ordinaries . . . and all and singular others, that have or do exercise any visitation or jurisdiction ecclesiastical within any part of this diocese, have uprightly, faithfully and unfeignedly, to the uttermost of their powers, observed in their own persons, and towards all other put in due execution, the Queen's Majesty's ecclesiastical laws, statutes, injunctions, and all her Highness' other commandments *published for uniformity of doctrine* and due order of the public ministration of God's holy word and sacraments, and have commended and favoured all such as sought the

* Ann. ch. 17. I. 1. 329. See p. 57 above.

† Life of Parker, bk. 2. c. 2. I. 145, &s., & bk. 3. c. 17. I. 491, and Records No. 53. III. 155.

‡ Wilk. Concil. IV. 252.

§ Strype's Life of Parker, bk. 2. c. 2. I. 147. ‖ See p. 48, 9 above.

same, and condignly punished all such as sought the contrary."*

Precisely to the same effect are the Injunctions of his successor Archbishop Grindal.

Thus in his Metropolitical Visitation of the Province of York in 1571, when Archbishop of that Province, the 14th Injunction to the clergy is, that they should read openly in their churches at certain times "a declaration of certain principal Articles of religion, set forth by both the Archbishops and the rest of the bishops of this realm *for the unity of doctrine*."† And the 24th Injunction to the laity is,—"the churchwardens and sworn-men of every parish shall likewise, halfyearly, present to the ordinary the names of all such persons whatsoever, either of the clergy or laity, that be . . . *preachers or setters forth of corrupt and popish doctrines;* . . . receivers of any vagabond popish priests, *or other notorious mislikers of true religion*, or maintainers of the unlearned people in ignorance and error, encouraging and moving them rather to pray in an unknown tongue than in English; or that stubbornly refuse to conform themselves to *unity and godly religion, now established by public authority*."‡

And in his Metropolitical Visitation of the Province of Canterbury in 1576, when Archbishop of that Province, the 19th Article is, "Whether any of your parsons, vicars, curates or ministers be . . . preachers of corrupt and *popish doctrine*, or," &c.;§ and the 23rd, "Whether any of your parsons, vicars, curates or ministers, or any other priest, or any lay man or woman, do wilfully maintain or defend any heresies, false opinions, or *popish errors, contrary to* the laws of Almighty God, and *true doctrine by public authority in this realm now set forth*,"‖ &c., (*showing that these "popish errors" were condemned by the standard of doctrine "set forth by public authority"*); and the 41st is,—"Whether there be any person or persons, ecclesiastical or temporal, within your parish, or elsewhere within this diocese, that of late have retained or kept

* Wilk. Concil. IV. 259, 60.
† Grindal's Works, p. 126.
‡ Ib. p. 144.
§ Ib. p. 163.
‖ Ib. p. 164, 5.

in their custody, or that read, sell, utter, disperse, carry, or deliver to others, any English books, set forth of late years at Louvain, or in any other place beyond the seas, by Harding, Dorman, Allen, Saunders, Stapleton, Marshall, Bristow, or any of them, or by any other English papist, *either* against the Queen's Majesty's supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, *or against true religion and catholic doctrine now received and established by common authority within this realm;* and what their names and surnames are?"*

Lastly, it appears by a decision of "all the judges," in the 23rd year of Elizabeth, that the Act of 1571, requiring subscription to the Articles, "was made *for avoiding a diversity of opinions;*" that the prevention of such diversity "*was the scope of the statute;*" and therefore that the subscription given must be such as does not make the statute of "none effect" to this purpose.†

The next point to which I would call the attention of the reader, is, that at the very same Convocation in 1562, at which the Articles were agreed upon, was passed what is called Nowell's Catechism. This catechism, Strype tells us, was "revised and approved by both houses of Convocation, anno 1562."‡ It had, says Bishop Randolph, "the express sanction of Convocation;" and was "publicly received and allowed."§ So Shepherd in his "Elucidation of the Book of Common Prayer," says,—"In 1562, the same year in which our present Articles of religion were agreed upon, Nowell's Catechism was presented in MS. to the Convocation, who *examined it with minute attention*, and after making several alterations, *unanimously sanctioned the performance by their synodal authority, and recommended it to public use.* Nowell, having received the book interlined, and in some parts blotted, caused the whole to be transcribed, and sent the fair copy to Cecil, 'not,' he informs him, 'in his own name, as afore, but *in the name of the clergy of the Convocation as their book*, seeing it was by

* Ib. 168, 9.

† Coke's Institutes, Pt. IV. p. 324.

‡ Ann. ch. 17. I. 1. 323.

§ Randolph's Enchirid. Theolog.; Preface.

them approved and allowed.' The MS. lay in Cecil's hands for above a year. It was then returned to Nowell with some learned notes upon it, and remained with him till 1570, when it was published, and dedicated to the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London, by name, and to all the bishops." Collier, who gives a similar account (Hist. vol. 2. p. 491), says that it was published at the request of the two Archbishops.

This Catechism, then, if anything, must be taken as expressing the sense of the ruling power in the Church of England at that period, and the character of the doctrine sought to be established therein.

Now from this Catechism I will quote one passage, commending the remainder to the attention of the reader. The question is asked,—"Shall we therefore not do right in invoking holy men who have departed out of this life, or even angels?" The reply is,—"By no means; for that would be either to attribute to them infinity, that they may be present everywhere, or the understanding of our secret thoughts, though absent from us, that is, a sort of divinity; and at the same time to transfer our confidence and hope, which ought to be placed wholly in God alone, partly to them, and thus *to fall into idolatry*. Moreover, when God calls us to himself alone, and promises, even with an oath, that he will hear and help us, to fly to others for help would be a sign of distrust and a certain proof of unbelief."*

Here, then, the Romish doctrine of invocation of saints is distinctly charged with involving *idolatry;* and that by the same body which remodelled and put forth the Thirty-Nine

* M. Annon ergo recte sanctos homines, qui ex hac vita abierunt, aut angelos etiam invocabimus? A. Minime; id enim esset, vel infinitatem illis, ut ubique præsentes sint, vel absentibus abditarum voluntatum nostrarum intelligentiam, hoc est, Divinitatem quandam tribuere; simulque fiduciam atque spem nostram, quæ tota in solo Deo collocanda esset, partim in ipsos transferre, atque ita in idololatriam prolabi. Sed et quum Deus ad se unum nos vocet, se nos et auditurum et adjuturum, interposito etiam jurejurando, promittat, ad aliorum opem confugere diffidentiæ esset, atque infidelitatis certum argumentum. Noell. Catech.; in Randolph's Enchir. Theolog. vol. 1. p. 287. 3rd ed.

Articles, and at the very same time when those Articles were being settled by them.

Another fact which, though only affording indirect evidence on the subject, is worth noticing, when our Articles are maintained to be reconcileable with the decrees of the Council of Trent, is, that immediately after the conclusion of that Council a work was published in this country against its decrees, which, says Strype, "seems to be done by Archbishop Parker, or his special order." Of this work Strype says,—"To fortify and arm our people against the decrees of this Council, and that it might have the less regard taken of it here in England, there came forth seasonably now a book entitled *A godly and necessary Admonition of the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent*," &c. "It was translated out of Latin, and imprinted at London by John Day, dwelling over Aldersgate, the 19th of February, 1564; no name of the author, but it seems to be done by Archbishop Parker or his special order."* And giving a more particular account of it further on, he says,—"In the preface is taken notice of the specious pretence of that Pope in calling again a Council of cardinals, bishops, and monks, at Trent, wherein he with great glory and magnificence promised both the purging of doctrine from all error and heresy, and also a speedy amendment of manners," &c. "But, saith the writer, if the canons and decrees, that came at length out of the Council, were examined, every Christian man should easily perceive, that these good holy fathers intended nothing less; yea, rather, all their labour was only to this purpose, to oppress sound doctrine; and that being oppressed, stubbornly to defend *idolatry, superstition and abuses*, which had been brought into the Church of God," &c. &c.†

If Strype's view is right, then, that this book was published under the auspices of Archbishop Parker, the work affords tolerably conclusive evidence how far the Archbishop would have put forth Articles reconcileable with the canons and decrees of

* Ann. ch. 36. I. 2. 59.

† Ib. ch. 39. p. 115. My knowledge of this work is only from the account of it given by Strype; but a copy is in the Bodleian Library.

the Council of Trent. The matter however is not worth inquiring further into, considering the abundant testimony we have on the subject.

But further; we find subscription to these Articles required as an evidence of recantation of popish errors. Thus in the year 1563, Dr. Marshall who had been a violent Romanist under Queen Mary, and who on the accession of Elizabeth "lurked about in the North, and had been with the Earl of Cumberland, but was at last taken up, and being brought before the Council, was committed to the Bishop of London in custody," was required, evidently in testimony of a recantation of his errors, to subscribe the Articles.* A copy of the paper signed by him to this effect is given by Strype.†

And when, in 1564, Grindal Bishop of London required his clergy to subscribe to the observance of the habits, the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer, the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions, and the Book of Convocation, that is, the Thirty-nine Articles, Strype tells us, that among those who refused to subscribe were some Papists, whose non-compliance could not have been produced by any objection to the habits.‡

Nay more; we happen to have the testimony of the very bishops who remodelled the Articles in 1562, (of whom Mr. Oakeley ventures to say, that it "appears to be historically certain," that they acted "with a studied reference to the views of those who retained their prepossessions in favor of the old religion,"§) that those Articles condemn the errors of the Romanists. In 1566 a Bill passed the Lower House of Parliament requiring subscription to the Articles; but after having been read once in the Upper House its further progress was stopped by order of the Queen. The bishops, however, were zealous for the passing of this Act, and Doctor Bennet in his "Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles," tells us (p. 258), that "there is in the Library of St. John's College in Cambridge, a rough copy of a Petition, interlined with Archbishop Parker's own hand, and marked with his red lead pencil,

* Ann. ch. 36. I. 2. 49.
† Ib.
‡ Strype's Life of Grindal, ch. x. pp. 145,6.
§ Pp. 38, 9.

which the bishops then presented to the Queen for that purpose." This Petition he proceeds to give at length, and in it we find the following words, (occurring among the reasons assigned for offering the Petition),—"Secondly, In the book, which is now desired to be confirmed, are contained the principal articles of Christian religion, most agreeable to God's word, publicly since the beginning of your Majesty's reign professed, and by your Highness' authority set forth and maintained. Thirdly, diverse and sundry errors, and namely *such as have been in this realm wickedly and obstinately by the adversaries of the gospel defended, are by the same Articles condemned.* Fourthly, the approbation of these Articles by your Majesty shall be a very good mean to establish and confirm all your Highness' subjects *in one consent and unity of true doctrine,* to the great quiet and safety of your Majesty and this your realm, whereas now for want of a plain certainty of articles of doctrine by law to be declared, great distraction and dissension of minds is at this present among your subjects, and daily is like more and more to increase, and that with very great danger *in policy,* the circumstances considered, [evidently referring again to the Romanists,] if the said book of Articles be now stayed in your Majesty's hand, or (as God forbid) rejected. Fifthly, considering that this matter so narrowly toucheth the glory of God, the sincerity of religion, the health of Christian souls, the godly unity of your realm, with the utility thereof, and the dangers on the contrary, we thought it our most bounden duties, being placed by God and your Highness, as pastors and chief ministers in this Church, and such as are to give a reckoning before God of our pastoral office, with all humble and earnest suit to beseech your Majesty to have due consideration of this matter, as the Governor and Nurse of this Church;" &c. &c. "At the top of the inner margin of the first sheet," adds Dr. Bennet, "are these words, (written, I am persuaded, with Archbishop Parker's own hand, only with a different pen and ink,) viz. *Exhibited to the Q. Majesty the 24th of December, anno* 1566."*

* Bennett's Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles, pp. 260, 1.

This important document appears to me to settle the whole question, for here we have a distinct contradiction of the hypothesis of Mr. Newman and Mr. Oakeley from the very persons who remodelled the Articles in 1562. If they rose from their graves to reply to it, they could not well give it a more distinct negative than is contained in this paper.

The desire of the bishops that all the clergy should at once be called upon to subscribe, was for the time disappointed; the Queen, it is said, forbidding the further progress of the Bill. But in 1571, the measure was allowed to pass.

We must first notice however the proceedings of Convocation in that year in the matter. The Convocation met early in April, having been opened by a sermon by Dr. Whitgift, (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury,) "where," says Strype, "the learned man aptly discoursed of the institution of synods; of *the enemies of the Church*, puritans *and papists;* of the garments and ornaments used in the Church; of divers things to be reformed in the present synod."* And in the canons passed at the synod was the following regulation;—"Every minister of the Church before he enters upon his sacred function shall subscribe all the Articles concerning the Christian religion agreed upon in Convocation; *and shall publicly make known to the people, wherever the bishop shall order it, his sentiments, what are his views concerning those Articles and their whole doctrine.*"†

The wording of this Canon is remarkable. It seems framed for the very purpose of shutting out the possibility of men qualifying themselves for places in the Church by subscription to the Articles, while not holding the doctrine intended to be inculcated by them. Nothing can show more clearly that the object of those who put them forth as the standard of the Church's

* Strype's Life of Parker, bk. 4. c. 5. II. 51.

† Quivis minister ecclesiæ, antequam in sacram functionem ingrediatur, subscribet omnibus articulis de religione Christiana, in quos consensum est in synodo; et publice ad populum, ubicunque episcopus jusserit, patefaciet conscientiam suam, quid de illis articulis et universa doctrina sentiat. Lib. quor. Can. 1571. Wilk. Concil. iv. 265.

doctrine was, that they should serve as a definite and certain test on the points treated of in them.

In the Parliament of the same year the Bill for enforcing subscription upon all the clergy was re-introduced and passed, the Queen having withdrawn her opposition. Her previous excommunication by the Pope and the rebellious conduct of some of her popish subjects, probably made her less anxious to avoid offending the papists. Mr. Oakeley seems to think, that this Bill had Nonconformists only in view, and that those who passed it had no eye to the papists in the matter. But this is altogether a mistake. True indeed it is, that there could hardly be any Romanists, having the shadow of a claim to consistency, left in the ministry of the Church at that time. But still it was believed, that there were some still lurking in it; and this Bill had an especial eye to them among others. This may be proved by some passages in the "Defence of the government established in the Church of England, for ecclesiastical matters," published by Dr. Bridges, Dean of Salisbury, (afterwards Bishop of Oxford,) in 1587, who had been a member of the Convocation in 1571, and therefore could not but know the meaning of the Parliament of the same year in enforcing subscription. Quoting the puritan work to which he was replying, he says,—"But our brethren, to mitigate the matter, say the Parliament had a godly meaning in making that statute, *for priests (that had been made in the time of popery) to profess their consent to the true doctrine, agreed upon in the Book of Articles,* by the public reading of the same book in their benefices." To which he answers,—"Yea, verily, the Parliament had therein a very godly meaning, and it was also as godly an act as meaning of the Parliament;" and then quoting the words of the Act, he adds,—"These are the very words of the statute; wherein what could they better have provided, than (whatsoever they should ordain, for *the bringing of those persons to the more sure confession and consent of sound religion*) first to come before the bishop," &c. &c.* Hence, both

* Pp. 1277, 8.

parties allowed, that the Act had particularly in view, among others, popishly affected persons.

And such also is the testimony of Strype. "This Act," he says, "was intended to keep out from ministering in the Church such as would not comply with the doctrine established in this Church of England in the beginning of the Queen's reign; and that the Queen's dominions might be served with pastors of sound religion, as the preamble ran. It concerned all such persons as pretended to be priests and ministers of God's word and sacraments under the degree of a bishop, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering, than the form set forth in the late King Edward's time, and now used in the reign of the Queen. (*Meaning undoubtedly to comprehend papists*, and likewise such as received their orders in some of the foreign reformed Churches, when they were in exile under Queen Mary.") *

The Articles therefore when enforced by Act of Parliament in 1571, were enforced as a test against popish errors. At this period the prudential reasons which had operated on the first accession of Queen Elizabeth to prevent the immediate and summary exclusion of all popishly affected persons from the ministry of the Church no longer existed. On the contrary, the time was arrived when such forbearance was no longer desirable.

Before we pass on, it seems obvious to inquire, on such a question as that before us, what has been the view hitherto taken of it in our Church. Now, that our Articles were intended as a test against the errors of the Church of Rome, our divines, whenever the subject has come before them, have with one voice, so far as I can find, affirmed. To go first to the works written expressly upon the Articles, let us refer to those of Rogers, Bennet, and Bishops Beveridge, Burnet, and Tomline.

The work of Thomas Rogers,† which appeared first in 1579,

* Annals ch. 7. II. 1. 104, 5.

† "The faith, doctrine, and religion, professed and protected in the realm of England and dominions of the same, expressed in Thirty-nine Articles," &c. There are several editions of the work. The first, under the title of "The English Creed," &c. was printed in 1579. See Wood's Athen. Oxon.

was long considered a sort of standard work on the subject. The author was chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, and the edition of 1607 is dedicated to the Archbishop. One object of this work was, as is stated in the title, to analyze the Articles into propositions, and show that those propositions were "agreeable both to the written word of God *and to the extant Confessions of all the neighbour churches christianly reformed;*" and the "*adversaries*" of the Articles are "*confuted;*" *and among the most prominent of those "adversaries" are the papists;** whose doctrine he calls in his dedication to the Archbishop in 1607, "the superstitious and anti-christian religion of the Church of Rome."

"The Articles were agreed on," says Dr. Bennet, in his "Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles," published in 1715, "(and consequently are to be subscribed,) as the title expresses it, *for the avoiding of diversities of opinions,* and for the *establishment of consent touching true religion.* But how could they serve the aforesaid end, if those who subscribed them, were not supposed to profess the belief of them? *They were manifestly designed as a test, to distinguish such as embraced the Reformation, from such as adhered to the Popish corruptions;* and that none might be allowed to minister in our churches, who did not embrace the established doctrines. But if men might subscribe what they did not believe, provided they would not publicly maintain their errors, then *the papists might still officiate, and none could distinguish the orthodox from the heterodox pastors.* In a word, unless the Articles were believed by those that subscribed them, the same diversities of opinions would still continue; nor would there ever be the more consent touching religion, than if those Articles had never been made."†

These remarks are made in reply to the notion that the Thirty-nine Articles may be subscribed as "Articles of peace," as it is said, and not "Articles of belief;" that is, that the subscription does not necessarily imply more than an undertaking

* See especially on Art. xxii, xxv, xxviii, xxix, xxxi.

† Pp. 412, 13.

not publicly to oppose the doctrine contained in them. A more flagrantly dishonest act than subscription by one who does not believe the doctrine of the Articles, (considering the nature of the subscription required,) can hardly be conceived. And its palpable dishonesty has, I suppose, deterred Mr. Oakeley from adopting this notion. But such a view is the only one that would bear out his claim to *hold* popish doctrines, while he admits that he is not at liberty to *teach* them ;* for if Roman doctrine is reconcileable with the Thirty-nine Articles, he is as much at liberty to *teach* as to *hold* it.

Again ; thus speaks Bishop Beveridge in his exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles : " I still shew each Article to be believed and acknowledged for a truth by the Fathers of the primitive church, that so we may see how, though in many things we differ from others, *and from the present Church of Rome,* yet we recede not in anything from the primitive and more unspotted Church of Christ."†

The work of Bishop Burnet on the Articles enters largely, throughout, on the subject of the doctrines of the Church of Rome condemned by the Articles ; and in his " Introduction," he gives as a reason for the Reformers descending into so many particulars in the Articles, their feeling the necessity of keeping the papists out of the Church, " that they might not secretly undermine and betray it ;" and adds, " now since the Church of Rome owns all that is positive in our doctrine, there could be no discrimination made, but by *condemning the most important of those additions that they have brought into the Christian religion,* IN EXPRESS WORDS."‡

Lastly, Bishop Tomline in his Exposition of the Articles, first published in 1799, observes,—" As all confessions of

* " Were I to be found *teaching* Roman doctrine in my public ministrations in your Lordship's diocese, I should, as I feel, most deservedly expose myself to your Lordship's censure. *It is plain that your Lordship, as a Bishop of our Church, could not, and would not, suffer it.*"—Mr. Oakeley's Letter to the Bishop of London, p. 13.

† Preface.

‡ Introduction, p. 5. 5th ed. Lond. 1746.

faith have had a reference to existing heresies, we shall here find not only the positive doctrines of the gospel asserted, but also *the principal errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome*, and most of the extravagancies into which certain Protestant sects fell at the time of the Reformation, *rejected and condemned*."*

The same view is maintained, as far as I can find, by all our divines of any note, without exception.

Thus, Bishop Pearson, in 1660, meeting the objection of the Nonconformists, that there are no Articles for discovering and condemning *sundry* points of Popery, says,—"To which my answer is, that if they mean no more than that which will discover a man to be a papist, there is abundantly sufficient contained in the Articles to discover any man. For we may assure ourselves, the Church of Rome will admit no man to their society who shall be ready to subscribe our Articles."†

So Dr. Waterland says,—"For does the faith of Christ lie in words only or in things? or is the repeating of the bare letter of Scripture, after a man has spirited away the sense, delivering divine truths, or contradicting and defeating them? To make the case plainer, I shall illustrate it by a resembling instance. Franciscus a Sancta Clara, a known papist, (who published his book A. D. 1634,) contrived to make our Thirty-nine Articles speak his own sentiments, reconciling them with great dexterity and most amazing subtilty to the Council of Trent. Now, put the question, whether upon his thus professing his faith in Protestant terms, popishly interpreted, he could justly claim every privilege of a Church of England man, and whether we were bound to receive him as a fellow Protestant. *A very little share of common sense, I presume, will be sufficient to determine the question in the negative.*"‡

"The greatest part of them [i. e. the Thirty-nine Articles]," says Bishop Conybeare, "are opposed to those dangerous opi-

* Elements of Christian Theology, vol. 2. p. 36. ed. 1799.

† No necessity of reforming the doctrine of the Church of England; pp. 15, 16. ed. 1660: or, in Hickes's Bibl. Script. pp. 351, 2.

‡ Waterland on the Importance of the doctrine of the Trinity, ch. 5. Works, vol. 5. p. 150. ed. Oxf. 1823.

nions which then prevailed. We had just separated from the Romish Church; but no security could be had, that the corruptions, which we had reformed, should not in a small time again prevail, but by taking the utmost care that the pastors of our Church should be free from those errors. *It is upon this account that a condemnation of several popish doctrines bears so great a part in our Articles;* and that determinations concerning some points are there made, which were scarce thought of in the more early ages."*

Thus, finally, Archbishop Potter, in a Charge delivered in 1719, says, that in the Articles, "beside other errors and heresies, those of the Church of Rome are expressly condemned."† And in a Defence of this Charge, replying to some censures that had been published on his remarks respecting subscription to the Articles, and showing that he did not disallow a latitude in their interpretation, "consistent with the literal sense of the Articles," he observes,—"But to say, as this writer doth, that 'there are not perhaps ten men in the Church now, who subscribe in their (the imposers) sense, to those Articles in which their sense is most known,' is so prodigious a calumny on the body of the clergy, that I am at a loss for a proper answer. All I can here conclude, is only this, that some of his particular friends have evasive arts to elude the true meaning of the Liturgy and Articles; but for the rest of the clergy, I am persuaded they are generally too honest men, to subscribe in any but the plain usual and literal sense of the words, and then they cannot fail of answering the true design of those who impose this subscription. It is plain, then, that nothing I have said is inconsistent with allowing a very great diversity of opinion; and perhaps there is no established Protestant Church in the world, the clergy whereof enjoy a greater liberty in this respect, than those of the Church of England; whereof, it were to be wished, that some of them would make a better use, than of late they have done. *But on the other side, it is no less*

* The case of subscription to Articles of religion considered. I quote from the edition in Randolph's Enchirid. Theolog. vol. 2, p. 61. 3d. ed.

† Charge to Dioc. of Oxford in 1719. Works, vol. I. p. 293.

plain, that there is a diversity of opinion, which the Articles were designed to prevent; as it is declared in the very title, which runs thus: 'Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, &c. for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion.' And if they were not intended to prevent some diversity of opinion, it would be hard to say, for what end or purpose they were intended. *Whosoever looks into them, will find several of the peculiar tenets of the Church of Rome there condemned: the Articles wherein this is done, were undoubtedly designed as a test against Popery;* AND HE WHO SHALL ALLOW PAPISTS TO SUBSCRIBE THESE, MAY WITH EQUAL REASON AFFIRM, THAT ANY PROTESTANT MAY LAWFULLY SET HIS HAND TO ALL THE DOCTRINES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT."*

Such are the views of *our own* divines on this subject.

And if we now turn to the divines of the Church of Rome, although there may have been members of that Church in this country, who, for whatever purpose, have endeavoured to force a sense upon the Thirty-nine Articles, which might bring them into some sort of agreement with, or at least non-opposition to, Roman doctrine, the hosts of controversial volumes published by their co-religionists against the doctrines of the Church of England clearly show the sense of the great body of their divines upon the subject.

Mr. Oakeley ventures to affirm, " as to the Articles, never, that I can find, were they urged or felt, as a ground of disunion between the churches; and this fact, as I must consider it, is further attested by the statement so commonly made, that Rome withdrew herself, and not was driven, from our communion." (p. 30, 31.)

Now the fact is, not only that these Articles are referred to in Romish controversial works as directly opposed to Roman doctrine, but they are noticed by one of the most eminent English Roman Catholic writers, Dr. Hawardine, (whom Dod calls " a person of consummate knowledge in all ecclesiastical

* Defence of Charge delivered to Clergy of Diocese of Oxford, July 1719. Works, vol. I. pp. 378, 9.

affairs, scholastic, moral, and historical, and to do him justice, perhaps, the present age cannot show his equal,") as alone a sufficient cause for the disruption of communion between the English and Roman churches.

In his " True Church of Christ Shewed," &c., controverting this statement, that the Roman Church separated from the Anglican, he says,—" Besides, the Thirty-nine Articles were set forth by the Church of England anno 1562, (that is, before the time of Pius V.,) requiring all the subjects of this church, as it is said in the preface, to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles. *Can Pope Pius, then, be supposed to have broken the communion? It is clear he did not.*" *

Again; in a learned work by Dr. Richard Smith, titular Roman Catholic bishop of Chalcedon, but acting as bishop of the Romanists in this country, entitled " Collatio doctrinæ Catholicorum ac Protestantium cum expressis S. Script. verbis," (Paris. 1622, 4to.), the Thirty-nine Articles are frequently referred to for the Protestant doctrine *as opposed* to the Catholic, that is, Roman doctrine.

As, for instance, Art. xxii. respecting the Invocation of saints. (p. 173.)

Also Art. xxiv. respecting public prayer in a language not understood by the people. (p. 396.)

Art. xii. respecting good works. (p. 416.)

Art. xi. respecting justification. (p. 433.)

Another learned English Romanist, Richard Broughton, wrote a work expressly in condemnation of the Thirty-nine Articles, entitled, " The judgment of the apostolic ages upon the Thirty-nine Articles," published at Doway, 1632, 8vo.†

Lastly, we would refer Mr. Oakeley to a work by John Roberti, written expressly in answer to T. Rogers's exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, entitled, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Reformatæ basis, Impostura. Luxemb. 1619, 8vo., of which a copy is in the Bodleian and the Cambridge University libraries.

* The true Church of Christ showed, &c., vol. i. p. 9, 2nd ed., 1738. See also Dr. Lingard's Hist. of England; Elizabeth, ch. iv. A. 1562, vol. v. pp. 207, 8.

† See Dod's Church Hist. under " Richard Broughton."

In his "Parasceue," or preface, speaking of Rogers's book, he says, "Articulos ordine ponit 39. Singulos dissolvit in suas propositiones; et his singulis subjungit probationes ut plurimum duplices; priores e Scriptura Sacra; posteriores ex authoritate Ecclesiarum extra Angliam Reformatarum. . . . In hunc librum cum nuper casu incidissem, deprehendi esse pestilentissimum, et si quem alium, ad innocentes animas, simplicesque in fraudem inducendas, aptissimum. Nam, cum quivis S. Scripturæ apex apud Christianos homines maximam merito habeat auctoritatem, et id jure persuadeat, quod laudat, hic liber ad trecentas et eo amplius ex eâdem Scriptura divina sententias affert *ad hæretica dogmata constabilienda, quæ Ecclesia Catholica, Dei Spiritu acta, detestatur, damnat, anathemate percellit.*"

Again;—"Non tracto omnes eorum Articulos, et Propositiones. *In nonnullis* enim non *dissentiunt* a nobis, ut cum docent, Deum esse trinum et unum." Parasc. §. viii. p. 35.

"Quasdam episcoporum propositiones, brevitatis causa, non pono integre, sed tantum quà *contra Ecclesiam Rom. pugnant.*" §. ix. p. 36.

He begins his work with the sixth Article, on the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, and commenting on the enumeration of the sacred books there given, he remarks,—"Non frustra hic insisto, O Angli miserabiliter seducti, O animæ Christi sanguine a Diaboli servitute miserrimâ vindicatæ, et a ministris, Diaboli emissariis, Christi sanguine conculcato, in lutum infernale provolutæ, non, inquam, frustra insisto. Siccine vos duci sinitis ad lanienam a prædonibus animarum vestrarum?" p. 17.

He closes his remarks on the doctrine of this Article with the observation,—"Venit mihi in mentem hunc meum libellum . . . incidere posse in alicujus imperiti manus, qui judicet, æque his argumentis revinci *Catholicos* atque Calvini asseclas: quandoquidem nec illi ex Scriptura Scripturam probare possunt. Errat, quisquis hæc objicit, ostenditque se discrimen inter *Catholicos* et sectarios in solidum ignorare, hac quidem in re. Principium illud et axioma, Nihil in rebus Fidei legitime probari

posse, nisi per Scripturam, hæreticum est, et hæreticorum, non Catholicorum, qui præter Scripturam etiam admittunt verbum Dei non scriptum, Traditiones, Conciliorum Canones, Pontificum Definitiones," &c.

On Art. xi., on Justification, on the proposition, "solum per fidem consemur justi coram Deo," he remarks,—" Paulo ante prima propositio excludebat *omnia* (etiam Fidem) præter meritum Christi. Jam hæc ita ponit *fidem* ut excludat meritum Christi. Omnia licent his episcopis. Sed quomodo hanc ostendunt? Audi. Probatio ex Verbo Dei. 1. Tantummodo crede. Marc. 5. 56. Non possum, quin iterum cum dolore et justa indignatione clamem, O miseri Angli, O miserabiliter seducti."

On the thirteenth Article, on works done before Justification, on the proposition, " Opera facta ante justificationem non merentur gratiam de congruo," he says, " Quanto honestius tacuissent episcopi et Clerus Angliæ hanc propositionem; quam nec ausi sunt conari ostendere ex Verbo Dei."

On the twenty-eighth Article, on the Lord's Supper, on the proposition, " Panis et vinum in cœna Domini non mutantur in aliam substantiam," he observes, " Hac propositione duo dogmata Catholica negant episcopi et clerici Anglici; transubstantiationem, et Christi præsentiam in Sacramento."

He ends his book thus,—" Mihi interea canam illud vetus,

" Homo qui erranti comiter monstrat viam, &c. &c.

" Et illud sanctius, (Jerem. 51. 9.) Curavimus Babylonem (Angliam) et non est sanata."

Mr. Oakeley, having disposed (as he conceives) of the Articles, goes on to consider what other acts or decisions of our Church can be brought forward as opposed to his views.

But before proceeding with him to this question, we must remind him of one authority which he seems wholly to have forgotten, though involved in his subscription to the Articles, namely the Book of Homilies,* which the thirty-fifth Article

* It may be observed here, as a mere matter of fact, that the Book of Homilies authorized by the Articles of 1562, (which are those to which subscription is required by the thirty-sixth canon,) did not contain the last homily of the second book, that against rebellion, which was not added till 1569.

declares "doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine." Now the second Homily of the second book, entitled "Against Peril of Idolatry," is written expressly against the worship given to images in and *by* the Church of Rome, and *in terms* accuses that church of idolatry. A few extracts will suffice to show this.

"Our images in temples and churches be indeed none other but idols, as unto the which idolatry hath been, is, and ever will be committed." *

"The opinion of all the rabblement of the Popish Church, maintaining images, ought to be esteemed of small or no authority, for that it is no marvel that they which have from their childhood been brought up amongst images and idols, and have drunk in idolatry almost with their mother's milk, hold with images and idols, and speak and write for them." †

"Of these things already rehearsed, it is evident, that our image maintainers have not only made images, and set them up in temples, as did the Gentiles idolaters their idols, but also that they have had the same idolatrous opinions of the saints, to whom they have made images, which the Gentiles idolaters had of their false gods. . . . And if this be not sufficient to prove them image-worshippers, that is to say idolaters, lo, you shall hear their own open confession; I mean, *not only* the decrees of the second Nicene Council under Irene, the Roman Council under Gregory III., in which as they teach that images are to be honoured and worshipped, as is before declared, so yet do they it warily and fearfully in comparison to the blasphemous bold blazing of manifest idolatry to be done to images, set forth of late," &c.‡

"At the second Council Nicene, the bishops and clergy decreed, that images should be worshipped; and so, by occasion of these stumbling-blocks, not only the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise, not the people only, but the bishops, not the sheep, but also the shepherds themselves, (who should have been guides in the right way, and lights to

* Christian Knowledge Soc. ed., 1833, p. 189. † Ib. 208.
‡ Ib. 255, 6.

shine in darkness,) being blinded by the bewitching of images, as blind guides of the blind, fell both into the pit of damnable idolatry. In the which all the world, as it were, drowned, continued until our age by the space of above eight hundred years, unspoken against in a manner. . . . So that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more."*

"Now concerning excessive decking of images and idols with painting, gilding, adorning with precious vestures, pearl and stone, what is it else, but for the further provocation and enticement to spiritual fornication, to deck spiritual harlots most costly and wantonly, which *the idolatrous church* understandeth well enough." †

And to these statements of the Homily against the peril of idolatry may be added a similar declaration in that for Whit Sunday. "The bishops of Rome," it remarks, "have for a long time made a sore challenge thereunto, [i. e. to the possession of the Holy Ghost,] reasoning with themselves after this sort. 'The Holy Ghost,' say they, 'was promised to the Church, and never forsaketh the Church. But we are the chief heads and the principal part of the Church, therefore we have the Holy Ghost for ever; and whatsoever things we decree are undoubted verities, and oracles of the Holy Ghost.' That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you, first, what the true Church of Christ is, and then to confer the Church of Rome therewith, to discern how well they agree together. The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone. Ephes. ii. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to

* Christian Knowledge Soc. ed., 1833, pp. 261, 262.

† Ib. 280, 281. See also pp. 242, 243, 246, 248, 249, 252, 288, 290.

Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. The description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith. Now if you will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is at present, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd; you shall well perceive *the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true church, that nothing can be more.* For neither are they built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesus; neither yet do they order the sacraments, or else the ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as he did first institute and ordain them; but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they may seem to be converted into a new guise. Christ commended to his Church a sacrament of his body and blood; they have changed it into a sacrifice for the quick and the dead. Christ did minister to his apostles, and the apostles to other men, indifferently under both kinds; they have robbed the lay people of the cup, saying, that for them one kind is sufficient. Christ ordained no other element to be used in baptism, but only water, &c. . . . They, &c. &c. . . . To be short, look what our Saviour Christ pronounced of the scribes and pharisees in the Gospel; the same may be boldly and with safe conscience pronounced of the bishops of Rome; namely, that they have forsaken, and daily do forsake, the commandments of God, to erect and set up their own constitutions. Which thing being true, as all they which have any light of God's word must needs confess, we may well conclude, according to the rule of Augustine, that the bishops of Rome and their adherents are not the true Church of Christ, much less then to be taken as chief heads and rulers of the same. Whosoever, saith he, do dissent from the Scriptures concerning the head, although they be found in all places where the Church is appointed, yet are they not in the Church; a plain place, concluding directly against the Church of Rome. *August. contra Petilian. Donatist. ep.*

cap. 4. Where is now the Holy Ghost, which they so stoutly do claim to themselves? Where is now the Spirit of truth, that will not suffer them in any wise to err? If it be possible to be there, *where the true Church is not*, then is it at Rome: otherwise it is but a vain brag and nothing else." *

Now, though it is freely admitted, that subscription to the Article respecting the Homilies does not bind the subscriber to every expression or incidental doctrinal statement contained in them, is it reconcileable with the notion, that one whole Homily and an elaborate dogmatical statement in another are altogether erroneous?

" What greater discovery," says Bishop Stillingfleet, " can be made of the sense of our church, than by the Book of Homilies, not barely allowed, but subscribed to as ' containing godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times?' and nothing can be more plainly delivered therein, than that the church of Rome is condemned for idolatry." †

And in his Defence of the work in which this passage occurs, replying to the objections that had been made by a Romish antagonist to this reference to the Homilies, he remarks,— " For the sense of the Church of England, I appealed to the Book of Homilies; not to any doubtful, or general, or single passage therein, but to the design of one of the largest and most elaborate Homilies in the whole Book, consisting of three several parts, the last of which is said not to be merely for the people, but for the instruction of those who were to teach them. . . . . But, saith J. G., why did I not appeal for the sense of our church to the Thirty-nine Articles? *As though the approbation of the Book of Homilies were not one of them, viz., the thirty-fifth*, ' The second book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, (among which titles the second is this of the peril of idolatry) doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times." Which Articles were not only allowed and approved by the Queen, but confirmed by the subscription of the hand of the Archbishop,

* Christian Knowledge Soc. ed., 1833, pp. 510—512.

† Discourse concerning the idolatry practised in the Church of Rome; Preface.

and bishops of the Upper House, and by the subscription of the whole clergy in the Nether House of Convocation A. D. 1571. Now I desire J. G. to resolve me, whether men of any common understanding would have subscribed to this Book of Homilies in this manner, if they had believed the main doctrine and design of one of them had been false and pernicious; as they must have done if they had thought the practice of the Roman Church to be free from idolatry. I will put the case, that any of the bishops then had thought the charge of idolatry had been unjust, and that it had subverted the foundation of ecclesiastical authority; that there could have been no church, or right ordination, if the Roman Church had been guilty of idolatry; would they have inserted this into the Articles, when it was in their power to have left it out? and that 'the Homilies contained a wholesome and godly doctrine,' which in their consciences they believed to be false and pernicious? I might as well think that the Council of Trent would have allowed Calvin's Institutions, as containing a wholesome and godly doctrine, as that men so persuaded would have allowed it the Homily against the peril of idolatry. And how is it possible to understand the sense of our church better, than by such public and authentic acts of it, which all persons who are in any place of trust in the church must subscribe, and declare their approbation of them? This Homily hath still continued the same, the Article the very same, and if so, they must acknowledge *this hath been and is to this day the sense of our church.* But saith J. G., the subscribing the Book of Homilies, as containing a godly and wholesome doctrine, doth not evince that every particular doctrine contained in it is such. *Be it so: but I hope it doth evince, that the subscribers did not think the main doctrine of any one Homily to be false.* Surely there is a great deal of difference between some particular passages and expressions in these Homilies, and that which is the main design and foundation of any one of them. But in this case we are to observe, that they who deny the church of Rome to be guilty of idolatry, do not only look on the charge as false, but as of dangerous

consequence; and therefore although men may subscribe to a book in general as containing wholesome and godly doctrine, though they be not so certain of the truth of every passage in it, yet they can never do it with a good conscience, if they believe any great and considerable part of the doctrine therein contained to be false and dangerous. *Such a subscription would be as apparently shuffling and dishonest as is the evasion of this testimony which J. G. makes use of for want of a better.*"*

The same view is taken by Bishop Burnet; who in his Exposition of the thirty-fifth Article says,—"This approbation is not to be stretched so far, as to carry in it a special assent to every particular in that whole volume; but a man must be persuaded of the main of the doctrine that is taught in them. To instance this in one particular; since there are so many of the Homilies that charge the Church of Rome with idolatry, and that from so many different topics, no man who thinks that Church is not guilty of idolatry, can with a good conscience subscribe this Article, That the Homilies 'contain a good and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times;' for according to his sense they contain a false and an uncharitable charge of *idolatry* against a church that they think is not guilty of it; and he will be apt to think that this was done to heighten the aversion of the nation to it. Therefore any who have such favourable thoughts of the Church of Rome, are bound by the force of that persuasion of theirs, *not to sign this Article, but to declare against it,* as the authorising of an accusation against a church, which they think is ill grounded, and is by consequence both unjust and uncharitable."†

But still further; the question of the force and meaning of the subscription to the thirty-fifth Article has been already mooted in our Church, and decided under the authority of the Sovereign and the Archbishop of Canterbury. During the reign of King James, Dr. John Burgess was deprived for nonconformity. "But," (I quote from Dr. Bennet's account of

* An answer to several late treatises, &c. 2d. ed. 1674. General Preface.

† Expos. of the Articles; on Art. 35. p. 473. He makes the same remark in his exposition of Art. 22. p. 295., 5th ed. 1746.

the matter,*) " afterwards he presented his sense of the terms [i. e. terms of subscription] required, first by the hands of the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Lancelot Andrews, I presume,) to King James the First, and then to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. G. Abbot: and thereupon he was restored to his ministry." And in his Rejoinder to Ames's reply to Bishop Morton's Defence of three ceremonies, &c., published in 1631 by the "special command" of King Charles I., he gives a full account of the matter, and " a particular of those interpretations of some things questioned in the matter of subscription, with which I had satisfied myself in former times," &c.; adding, "These interpretations King James accepted, and my Lord's Grace of Canterbury affirmed them to be the true sense and intention of the Church of England."

"Whoever," adds Dr. Bennet, " considers the circumstances above related, will be forced to acknowledge that no interpretation of the sense of our subscription to the thirty-fifth Article can be more authentic, than that which was accepted, as well by King James I., (in whose time the canon prescribing the form of it was made,) as by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and publicly declared to have been so accepted, in a book published by so remarkable a command of King Charles I. Now that interpretation of the subscription follows in these very words.

" 'X. Of the two books of Homilies.

" 'I undertake not to approve of every phrase or allegation of Scripture, as fitly applied to the mind of the Holy Ghost; but that *dogmatically* there is nothing delivered in those Homilies, that I know to be contrary to the word of God, but that they may lawfully and profitably be read to the people for their edification, when better means are wanting: and in this sense, I subscribe to those Books also.'

" Wherefore let any conscientious and candid person judge. The Article asserts, that the two Books of Homilies do contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, necessary for these times: nor

* Directions for studying Divinity and the Thirty-nine Articles. Lond. 1714. 8vo. p. 147.

is there any doubt, but we are absolutely bound to subscribe the truth of this proposition. But the question is, in what sense this proposition is true, and whether that sense be allowed in the subscription. Now I think, the truth of that proposition, in Dr. Burgess's sense, is exceedingly evident: and you see, that sense is allowed and declared to be the true one by the most competent authority. So that I do not pretend, that a man may subscribe the thirty-fifth Article in a looser sense than he subscribes the other Articles, (for that would be downright knavery and prevarication,) but I contend, that that proposition, to which we do thus absolutely subscribe, as fully and heartily as to any of the rest, is not to be understood in that rigid sense, which some persons, for very ill ends, would fasten on it."

And then, having made some remarks in opposition to the notion that the subscription to the thirty-fifth Article involved a subscription to every proposition contained in the Homilies, (his object being to show, that the subscription to the thirty-fifth Article must not be interpreted in too rigid a sense,—*which makes his remarks still more forcible for our present purpose,*) he adds, "If it be asked, by what rule we shall know, what those doctrines are, which we profess our approbation and belief of, by subscribing the thirty-fifth Article concerning the Homilies; I answer, that our subscription does undoubtedly extend to all the doctrines contained in every one of those Homilies which our subscription includes; and that we must judge, which are the doctrines in each Homily, after the same manner as we judge with respect to other writings. Now by the doctrines of any other writing we constantly mean those points which the author lays down, and sets about the proof of, giving his judgment and determination concerning them. Thus we are understood, when we say, that such a book contains sound doctrine. We are not supposed to declare, that every argument therein urged is in our opinion valid, that every proposition in the declamatory part is strictly true, that every illustration is exactly just and home; those, I say, and the like particulars are by no means implied in our saying, that the

book contains sound doctrine; but our saying so signifies thus much (and no more), viz. that those propositions which the author attempts to establish and convince his reader of, by such arguments as he produces and offers for that purpose, that those propositions, I say, which he delivers *dogmatically*, (to use Dr. Burgess's expression in the Interpretation above recited,) are really true: though perhaps at the same time divers mediums for the confirmation of them, divers occasional assertions, and the like, may justly be excepted against. The application of this rule to our Homilies is so very easy, that no man of common sense can mistake it; and therefore I shall not waste words upon it."*

II. Having thus disposed of the question so far as relates to our Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies, we proceed (with Mr. Oakeley,) to consider it with regard to any other decisions of the Church.

Mr. Oakeley says that a Canon of the Synod of 1640 under Archbishop Laud, is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, "the only document of the nature of an ecclesiastical decision (and the observation may be extended to *political* enactments, between the periods of the Reformation and Revolution of 1688,) which condemns any *doctrine* of Rome, as distinct from the Papal claim of *jurisdiction* in this realm;"(p. 42); which assertion however he qualifies in a subsequent note, by admitting that the Test Act in the time of Charles II. is an exception to it. It is indeed an exception, and a far more important one than would appear by Mr. Oakeley's account of the matter. There are however other exceptions, and therefore we shall now proceed to point out in chronological order some of the instances we have met with of decisions by public authority among us against the doctrine of the Church of Rome since the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

And among the first are several to which we have already had occasion to direct the attention of the reader, and to which therefore we shall here only refer.

* Ib. pp. 147-51.

(1.) The first is to be found in the Injunctions (Injunc. 23) and Articles of Visitation (Art. 2,) issued by Queen Elizabeth in the year 1559; which we have already noticed in pp. 44, 45, above.

(2.) The second is in Bishop Jewell's Apology of the Church of England; given in pp. 52,3 above.*

(3.) The third is in Dean Nowell's Catechism, quoted p. 82 above.

(4.) The fourth is in a public Form of prayer for the Plague, issued in 1563 by public authority, i. e. of the Queen and Metropolitan, according to the Act of Parliament.

One of the Prayers of this Service contains the following passage,—"Thou hast called us to the knowledge of thy gospel. Thou hast released us from the hard servitude of Satan. Thou hast delivered us from all *horrible and execrable idolatry, wherein we were utterly drowned,* and hast brought us into the most clear and comfortable light of thy blessed word, by the which we are taught how to serve and honour thee;" &c. †

This form was to be used (see title) in Common Prayer, twice a week throughout the kingdom.

The testimony hence derived is peculiarly strong; because the introduction of such an expression into *a public form of prayer* ordered to be used throughout the kingdom, shows, even more than a mere dogmatical decision on the subject, how deeply seated such a view was in the minds of our Reformers, and their desire to impress it upon the minds of the people.

And yet, in the face of such testimonies, Mr. Oakeley ventures to say, that "the Reformers themselves were without any precise doctrinal views of their own upon the points in controversy," and that "the necessities of their position" "obliged them to a course of the strictest neutrality." (p. ix.)

(5.) The fifth is in a public form of thanksgiving in the thirty-seventh year of Queen Elizabeth, A. 1594, in which

* The reader who desires to see more passages on the subject than are there quoted, and in the original Latin, may consult pp. 129; 149, 50; 151, 2; 169, 70; 171, 2; 178; 180; 189; 194; of the edition in Randolph's Enchiridion, vol. 1. 3d. ed. 1825.

† Grindall's Works, p. 38.

Popery is called "*that idolatrous religion*;" * to which, of course, the same remark applies as we have made respecting the last.

(6.) The sixth is in the canons of the synod of 1640 under Archbishop Laud.

The third of these canons is entitled, "For the suppressing the growth of Popery;" and enacts that "all and every ecclesiastical persons, of what rank or condition soever, . . . shall use respectively all possible care and diligence, by conferring privately with the parties, and by censures of the Church in inferior and higher courts, as also by complaints unto the secular power, to reduce all such to the Church of England who are misled into Popish superstition. . . . This sacred synod doth earnestly intreat the reverend justices of assize to be careful in the execution of the said laws committed to their trust, as they will answer to God for the daily increase of this gross kind of superstition." †

The sixth canon is entitled, "An oath enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and government," and enacts as follows;—"This present synod (being desirous to declare their sincerity and constancy in the profession of the doctrine and discipline already established in the Church of England, and to secure all men against any suspicion of revolt to *Popery or any other superstition*) decrees, that all archbishops and bishops, and all other priests and deacons in places exempt or not exempt, shall, before the 2d day of November next ensuing, take this oath following, against all innovation of doctrine or discipline. . . . . I, A. B., do swear that I do approve the doctrine and discipline or government established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation: and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in *any Popish doctrine*, contrary to that which is so established: nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by arch-

* Stillingfleet's Answer to Several Treatises, Preface, c. 7. (The *pages* are not numbered.)

† Wilk. Concil. iv. 546, 7.

bishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, &c., as it stands now established, and as by right it ought to stand; nor yet ever to subject it to the usurpations and *superstitions of the See of Rome,*" &c. *

And in the seventh we read, that " at the time of reforming this Church from *that gross superstition of Popery,* it was carefully provided, that all means should be used to root out of the minds of the people, both the inclination thereunto, and memory thereof, especially of the *idolatry committed in the mass,* for which cause all Popish altars were demolished." †

Mr. Oakeley admits (p. 42), that these canons *do* contain a condemnation of Roman doctrine; which, indeed, it would be difficult to deny; though not more so, as it appears to me, than to deny the same with respect to our Articles.

Now these canons were published with the formal consent of the Crown attached to them; and therefore, *at the time,* were of equal authority with the canons of 1604. But the great rebellion occurring almost immediately after, they were probably never enforced; and, as Bishop Stillingfleet tells us, " after the King's restoration, an Act of Parliament passed (13 Car. ii. c. 12,) for restoring the bishops' ordinary jurisdiction, wherein a clause is added, *that this Act did not confirm those canons of* 1640, but left the ecclesiastical laws as they stood 1639; which Act being passed by the King's assent, it voids the former confirmation of them, and so leaves them without force." ‡

These canons, therefore, can only be considered as representing the sentiments of the authorities of the Church of England at the time at which they were passed. But then, how important are they, merely in this point of view, in connexion with our present subject. For if the English bishops *under the primacy of Laud* formally condemned the doctrine of Rome, is it any longer a question what the character of our standards of doctrine is on the subject? It is so notorious, and, in fact, in-

* Ib. p. 549. † Ib.

‡ Stillingfleet's Eccl. Cases, Pt. 1. p. 253, ed. 1702.

sisted upon by those who take Mr. Oakeley's views,* that there was a movement in the *direction* of Roman doctrine in our Church in the time of Laud, and a clear desertion of the precise ground previously occupied by the authorities of our Church as to doctrine, that the decision, coming from such a quarter, is overwhelmingly contradictory of the hypothesis we are opposing.

(7.) The seventh is the rubric inserted at the end of the Communion Office in the Prayer-book in 1661, by the united authority of the Convocation and the Parliament.

This rubric runs thus,—"Whereas it is ordained in this office for the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; it is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

This rubric is very nearly the same as one that occurs in the same place in the second Prayer-book of Edward VI., and was omitted in the Prayer-books of Elizabeth and James I.;—the only real difference being, that instead of the words "*corporal* presence," the previous rubric had "*real and essential* presence there being."

Of this alteration, as we have already observed, Mr. Oakeley

* See Brit. Crit. No. lxiv., Oct., 1842, vol. xxxii. pp. 300, et seq.

avails himself,* as if it rendered the rubric consistent with his views, by making it condemn "not formal statements, but loose and popular views, of doctrine;" and he quotes Dr. Cardwell's remark upon the change as if it was confirmatory of his argument. Now what Dr. Cardwell says, (which the reader will find below,)† is merely a repetition of what we have already quoted ‡ from Archbishop Tenison in explanation of the change; that is, that the words "real and essential" were "subject to misconstruction," and therefore altered. The question between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, properly stated, is not, whether there be any real and essential presence of Christ in the Eucharist; for as Archbishop Tenison says, "real it is, if it be present in its real effects, and they are the essence of it so far as a communicant doth receive it; for he receiveth it not so much in the nature of a thing, as in the nature of a privilege;" referring to the words of Bishop Jewell in his Apology,—"Christum enim asserimus vere se præsentem exhibere in sacramentis suis; in baptismo, ut eum induamus; in cœna, ut eum fide et spiritu comedamus, et de ejus cruce ac sanguine habeamus vitam æternam:" § and so Dr. Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, in his able reply to Woodhead's charge against our Church of varying in this point of doctrine, says, that our Church "always held a real presence so far as a real participation implies one, but always denied it, if by real we mean corporal and local;" ‖ and that "King Edward's rubric by *real and essential* means (as the

* See note, p. 43

† "The fate of the rubric is worthy of notice. It was excluded by Queen Elizabeth in 1559; and its removal clearly shows, that the Church could not then be brought to express an opinion adverse to the real presence: it was restored in 1661, on the revision of King Charles II.; and its reappearance may likewise be employed to show, that the Church at that time also was unwilling to make any declaration on that important tenet. To prevent misapprehension on this point, the words 'or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood,' were altered to the very different expression, 'or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.'" Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences, p. 35, note.

‡ See p. 76, above.

§ Tenison on Idolatry, p. 181.

‖ Reply to Two Discourses, &c., p. 4.

Papists then used to do) *a real and bodily* presence, as is plain by the Articles set forth about the same time;"* which precisely agrees with the statement of Archbishop Cranmer, already quoted,† by whom the former rubric was put forth. There was no real change of doctrine therefore involved in the alteration of the rubric, but merely the substitution of a clearer phrase for one more open to misconstruction.

But the chief question is, what is the force of the rubric as it now stands? Is it condemnatory of Roman doctrine? The change, even if it be allowed to be, as Mr. Oakeley contends, " in a more catholic direction," will avail him nothing, if after all it left it anti-Roman. And this, I maintain, it clearly does; and in opposition to Mr. Oakeley's *assertion,* it is easy to show, that it condemns not merely " loose and popular views of doctrine" among the Romanists, but " formal statements of doctrine," such as must be considered as representing truly the doctrine of the Church of Rome.

We have already shown, that Cranmer was condemned for holding, among other things, that Christ was not *corporally* (*corporaliter*) present in the Eucharist.‡ What moreover is the language of the Council of Trent? " In the first place the holy synod teaches, and openly and plainly professes, that in the benign holy sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ true God and man, is truly, really, and *substantially* [i. e. corporally] contained under the form of those sensible things;" § and the first canon on the subject is,—" If any one shall deny, that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly, really and *substantially* the body and blood together with the soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in fact whole Christ, but shall say that they are in it only in the way of sign, or figure, or virtue, let him be anathema." ‖

* Ib. p. 9. † See p. 75, above. ‡ See p. 76, above.

§ Principio docet sancta synodus, et aperte ac simpliciter profitetur, in almo sancto Eucharistiæ sacramento, post panis et vini consecrationem, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum verum Deum atque hominem, vere, realiter, ac substantialiter, sub specie illarum rerum sensibilium contineri. Synod. Trid. Sess. 13. c. 1.

‖ Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ sacramento contineri vere,

And hence a learned Roman Catholic divine, speaking of "the four main points, that are maintained by the supreme church-authority, to which Protestants refuse conformity, and at which they take most offence," reckons as the first of them, "the *corporal* presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, and consequently adoration of them as present." *

And if it be said, that the words "corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" refer only to the presence of the body *in a natural manner*, and that the Council of Trent itself seems to maintain, that it is present, *in a natural manner*, only at the right hand of the Father, † the words that follow show that this explanation will not reconcile the rubric to Roman doctrine, for it is there said that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and *not here*, it being," &c.; and, as a learned man who left us for the Roman communion, Abraham Woodhead, observes, "these two are very different, *the natural body is not here*, and, *the natural body is here, but not after a natural mode;*" ‡ and moreover, as he proceeds to remark, the *reason* given, that it is "against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one," shows that the doctrine of our divines differs from that of Rome, for "if they hold the natural body to be there [in the sacrament] as well as in heaven, this its being there (though there *modo non naturali*) overthrows this reason, by its being still in two places, the same time; in one, *modo naturali*, in the other, *modo non naturali*." §

realiter, et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum; sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo, ut in signo, vel figura, aut virtute, anathema sit. Ib. Can. 1.

* Woodhead's Considerations on the Council of Trent, p. 228.

† Nec enim hæc inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dexteram Patris in cœlis assideat, juxta modum existendi naturalem; et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis sacramentaliter præsens suâ substantiâ nobis adsit, eâ existendi ratione, quam etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo, cogitatione per fidem illustratâ, assequi possumus, et constantissime credere debemus. Synod. Trid. Sess. 13. c. 1.

‡ Two Discourses concerning the adoration of our Blessed Saviour in the Eucharist, p. 31.

§ Ib.

Moreover in other parts of the rubric the Roman doctrine is contradicted in terms. Thus it is said, that "the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances;" whereas the Council of Trent expressly affirms, that "by consecration there is produced a change of the bread and wine, of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of our Lord Christ, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which change is conveniently and properly called by the holy catholic Church transubstantiation:"* and an anathema is pronounced against those who deny such a change. †

Similarly it is maintained, that the consecrated elements "may not be adored, for that were *idolatry*, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;" whereas the Council of Trent maintains, that through the transubstantiation which takes place in the elements, "no room for doubt remains but that all Christ's faithful people should, according to the custom always received in the Catholic Church, pay to this most holy sacrament in their devotions to it, that worship of *latria* which is due to the true God," ‡ and an anathema is pronounced against those who say that such worship ought not to be offered. § So that as Archbishop Tenison, in a work published within eighteen years of the restoration of this rubric, says, "This rubric doth in effect charge the Church of Rome with gross idolatry;" ‖ and thus Dean Aldrich remarks, "As the Church ever held a real, so she ever denied a corporal, i. e. a local presence; and for that reason forbid the adoration of the symbols. For (to say no more at present) the same arguments that will justify our adoring them upon the score of any, but a

* Per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri, totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus. Quæ conversio convenienter et propric a sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiatio est appellata. Sess. 13. c. 4.

† Ib. Can. 2; and see Can. 3 and 4.

‡ Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper recepto latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant.

§ Ib. Can. 6.

‖ Of idolatry, p. 180.

local presence of Christ's natural body, will excuse not only the *Popish*, but even the grossest heathen *idolatry*." *

The Dean's statement of the doctrine of our Church on this subject is so judicious, and the work in which it occurs so far from common, that the passage, though a long one, will I think be acceptable to the reader.

" The natural body of our blessed Saviour," he says, " comes under a twofold consideration in the Eucharist. 1. *As a body dead;* under which notion we are said to eat it in the sacrament, and to drink the *blood as shed;* as appears by the words of the Institution, *Take and eat, this is my body which is given or broken for you; Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood which is shed for you:* in which words (as Mr. Bradford, Acts and Monuments, p. 1611, long ago observed) what God has joined we are not to put asunder. 2. *As a glorified body;* in which condition it now sits at the right hand of God, and shall there continue till the restitution of all things, imparting Grace and Influence and all the benefits purchased by the Sacrifice of the dead body, to those that (in the holy Eucharist most especially) are through Faith and by the marvellous operation of the Holy Ghost incorporated into *Christ;* and so united to him that they *dwell in Christ and Christ in them; they are one with Christ and Christ with them; they are made members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones;* and by partaking of the Spirit of him their head, receive all the graces and benefits, purchased for them by his bitter death and passion.

" Wherefore it is evident that since the body *broken* and the blood *shed* neither do nor can now really exist, they neither can be really present, nor literally eaten, or drank, nor can we really receive *them*, but only the benefits purchased by them. But the body which now exists whereof we partake, and to which we are united, is the glorified body: which is therefore verily and indeed received (as we shall see anon) and by consequence said to be Really present notwithstanding its Local absence, because a real participation and union must needs imply a *Real* presence, though they do not necessarily require a *Local*

* Reply to two Discourses, &c., p. 3.

one. For it is easy to conceive how a thing that is Locally Absent may yet be Really Received, as he *that receives a disciple* is said to *receive Christ;* as the disciples themselves *received the Holy Ghost;* as the King in the Gospel *received a Kingdom;* or as we commonly say a man *receives an estate or inheritance* when he receives the Deeds or Conveyances of it. In all which cases the reception is confessedly real, though the thing itself is not locally or circumscriptively present, or literally grasped in the arms of the receiver.

"This by the way may serve to show the vanity as well as falsehood of Transubstantiation, which was first devised to solve the *literal* eating of the *glorified* body of our Saviour: whereas though the body that *is* glorified, be numerically the same that *was* broken; yet the body which is *eaten as dead*, and the body which is *present as glorified*, are two as different things as can well be imagined.

"This may likewise serve to show, that there is no great disagreement among those Protestants, whom the Papists too hastily charge with it. For they all agree that we spiritually eat *Christ's* body and drink his blood: that we neither eat nor drink nor receive the *dead body* nor the *blood shed*, but only the *benefits* purchased by them: that these benefits are derived to us, by virtue of our union and communion with the glorified body: and that our partaking of it, and union with it, is effected by the mysterious and ineffable operation of the Holy Spirit. The only difference is, that one part from the premises infer, that *Christ* may be truly said to be *Really Present* in the Eucharist; whereas the other scruple at the use of *that expression* (because the local absence of his body is confessed on both sides) notwithstanding they agree in all the points which the other party think requisite to defend it.

"Now though it be easy, as I said before, to conceive how a natural substance may be said to be *Really Received* though not *Locally Present;* it is not so easy to conceive it *Really Present* when at the same time it is *Locally Absent*. Therefore the Church of England has wisely forborne to use the term of *Real Presence* in all the books that are set forth by her autho-

rity. We neither find it recommended in the *Liturgy*, nor the *Articles*, nor the *Homilies*, nor the *Church's*, nor *Nowell's Catechism*. For although it be once in the *Liturgy*, and once more in the *Articles*, it is mentioned in both places as a phrase of the Papists, and rejected for their abuse of it. So that if any Church-of-England-man use it, he does more than the Church directs him; if any reject it, he has the Church's example to warrant him: and it would very much contribute to the peace of Christendom if all men would write after so good a copy.

"Yet it must not be denied but the term may be safely used amongst scholars; and seems to be grounded upon the language of Scripture itself. For when our Saviour promises *to be in the midst of them that call upon him*, and *to be with his Church always to the end of the world*, no doubt he promises to be *really present* with them, though he does not mean that his Natural Body shall be *locally present* amongst them. So St. Paul speaks of his own being *absent in Body*, but *present in Spirit*, 1 Cor. v. 3. The Romans used to call their gods *Præsentes Deos*, not as *locally present* but always *ready to assist* them: and whatever is in readiness when we want it, to answer our occasions, may be properly said παρειναι, *to be at hand, to be present*. A man does truly *repræsentare pecuniam* when he gives a good bill for it, though he does not pay it down *in specie*. The Holy Ghost is said to *abide and dwell in us;* which words imply a *continual presence;* no doubt *Real*, though not *Physical* and *Local*, but only by his grace and influence. In short, whatever we enjoy, use, and reap the benefit of, as truly as if it were *præ sensibus*, is as *Really* present as if it were *Physically* so: nay no doubt when virtue went out of our Saviour's body to heal the woman in the Gospel, though the Jews thronged him, and she did but touch his garment, yet his body was *more really* present to her whom the virtue of it healed, than to them whom the substance of it touched.

"So much for the use of the word: which when we of the Church of England use, we mean thus. A thing may be said to be *really received*, which is so consigned to us, that we can readily employ it to all those purposes, for which it is useful in

itself, and we have occasion to use it: and a thing thus *really received* may be said to be *really present* two ways, viz., either *Physically* or *Morally*, to which we reduce *Sacramentally*. A *Physical* presence (now we speak of a natural body) is *local; antecedent* to the reception and *independent* upon it: the thing is first *really present* and then *really received;* and though it were not *received*, would be still *really present*. A *moral presence* is only *virtual, consequent* to the reception and *dependent* upon it: the thing is first *really received*, and by consequence said to be *really present;* but it is not at all *present* to them that do not *really receive it*. Thus in the holy Eucharist, the *Sacrament* is *Physically*, the *res Sacramenti Morally*, present; the *elements Antecedently* and *Locally*, the *very body Consequentially* and *Virtually*, but both *Really present*.

"From hence it is evident, that if we rightly understand the Presence, it is not material with what adverbs we affirm it. We may say it is *Really, Essentially*, nay *Corporally* present: that is, it is *present* in as much as it is *Really received* to all intents and purposes, for which the *Res ipsa*, the *Essence*, the *Substance*, the *very Body* would be useful to us, if it were *Physically* and *Locally* present. And the difference between us and the Papists is plain. They (however they express themselves) understand a *Local* presence, which we deny and therefore reject their expression. We (whatever term we use) mean only a *Spiritual and Virtual* presence, and explain the term we make use of to that effect. Thus the Protestants in King Henry the eighth's time, that suffered upon the six Articles, denied the *Real Presence* (i. e. the Popish sense of it), but meant the same thing with us, who think, we may lawfully use that term. On the other side that excellent person and glorious martyr Mr. Bradford, (Acts and Monuments p. 1608,) '*I do believe*, (says he) *that Christ is* Corporally *present, at and in the due administration of the Sacrament.*' But he adds this explication, '*By this word* Corporally *I mean that Christ is present Corporally* unto Faith.'

"It is likewise evident, that when we say Christ is *present*, or *adorable in the Sacrament*, we do not mean *in the Ele-*

ments, but *in the Celebration.* We affirm his natural body to be *Locally* in Heaven and not here; and that we, who are here and not in Heaven, ought to worship it as *Locally present in Heaven,* while we celebrate the Holy Sacrament upon earth.

"Lastly, it is evident, that this doctrine is sufficiently removed from what the pamphlet calls *Zuinglianism,* how truly I will not now inquire. For we do not hold that we barely receive the *Effects* and *Benefits* of Christ's body; but we hold it *Really Present* in as much as it is *Really Received,* and we actually put in possession of it though *Locally absent* from us. So that while we *Spiritually* eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, we through faith, in a mysterious and ineffable manner, dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us; and by virtue of this *Spiritual* and *Mystical* yet *Real Participation,* we receive the *Benefits Consequent* to it; even the remission of our sins and all other benefits of Christ's Passion.

"This in short is our meaning; and to this effect all true Church-of-England-men declare it."*

(8.) The eighth is the declaration against transubstantiation in the Act of Parliament, 25 Car. II. c. 2. (a. 1673.), entitled "An Act for preventing dangers which may happen from Popish recusants," in which, to prevent Papists from holding any public offices of trust, all persons appointed to such offices were required to make the following declaration,—"I A. B. do declare, that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the Elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever."†

(9.) The ninth is a still fuller declaration against *several of the principal doctrines of the Church of Rome* in the Act of Parliament, 30 Car. II. c. 1. (stat. 2.) a. 1678, required to be made and subscribed by the members of both Houses of Parliament; and by subsequent Acts, namely 1 Will. & Mary, c.

* Ib pp. 13—18 † Gibson's Cod i. 395.

2.* and 12, 13 Will. III. c. 2.† required to be made and subscribed by every Sovereign on coming to the throne.

The obligation enforced by these latter Acts, namely that this Declaration shall be made and subscribed by every Sovereign on coming to the throne, remains still in force.

Now this Declaration runs thus,—"I A. B. do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, That I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine, into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever: and that *the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are* SUPERSTITIOUS AND IDOLATROUS. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this Declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants," &c. &c.‡

And it is evident, that this Declaration cannot be understood as referring to any mere *corruptions* of Roman doctrine, because that would have frustrated the very object of the Declaration; which was, to exclude all Romanists.

Such, then, is *the law* of this country on the subject.

III. We are next referred to "two remarkable attempts (among others) which have been made in different ages and (as there is reason to suppose) on different sides of the Church, in this country, of a character somewhat similar to the Essay which has lately attracted so much notice and censure." (p. 17.)

To these instances, then, we would in the next place call the reader's attention; and we must set out by observing, that the supposition that these attempts were made "*on different sides of the Church*," is *altogether a mistake*, as we shall show here-

* Gibson's Codex i. 607. † Gibson's Cod. ib.

‡ Gibson's Codex i. 583.

after. Indeed we know of no attempt of the kind, but from Roman Catholic pens.

The first attempt of this kind here referred to (p. 47 et seq.) is that by Christopher Davenport, or, according to his Romish name, Francis a Sancta Clara, in a work entitled, "Deus, Natura, Gratia, sive Tractatus de Prædestinatione," &c., of which two editions were published, Lugd. 1634, sm. 8vo. "Although written," says Mr. Oakeley, "with a somewhat different object from Tract 90, it will be found to suggest an interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, in many respects strikingly similar to that put forward by Mr. Newman. As this fact has been publicly urged in objection to the Tract, I will at once admit the accuracy of the statement." In this work is to be found, no doubt, a most ingenious attempt to reconcile all our Articles with Roman doctrine, though Mr. Oakeley allows (contrary to what he states in a preceding page, quoted p. 6 above) that "in some very few cases (especially Art. xxxi. and xxxvii.) he admits a great *apparent* difficulty, but maintains that it is apparent only;" (p. 48.); which admission is very necessary, as the first remark made on Art. xxxi. is, "Totus hic Articulus *durissimus* videtur; rectius tamen introspiciendo, non *adeo* veritati discordem judicem;" (p. 399.); and on the 22nd, "Verba in frontispicio sine dubio *durissima;*" (p. 349.); and in the latter case, the only way in which he can get over the difficulty, is by maintaining that what is condemned in the words "Romish doctrine" is not the real doctrine of the Church of Rome, but that which the Protestants falsely attributed to it; (p. 351); as if our Reformers did not know what the real doctrine of the Church of Rome was.

However, we have no anxiety to deny, that, in the face of all that Romanists had ever urged against our Church, we have in this work an attempt by a Romanist to show that all our Articles may be interpreted so as not to condemn the doctrine of the Church of Rome.

But the question is, what entertainment this book met with from the Church of England; and we find on inquiry that it was directly discountenanced. The views advocated in this

work were distinctly repudiated by Archbishop Laud himself. For it being one of the charges against him at his trial, that he had encouraged Davenport in the publication of this work, the Archbishop himself states,* that his reply was, that the author of this work, having come to him to ask his licence for printing it, and having communicated to him its substance, "I found the scope of his book to be such as that the Church of England would have little cause to thank him for it, and so absolutely denied it." And in opposition to Mr. Oakeley's statement (p. 47, *note*), that Davenport "appears to have lived on terms of familiarity with Laud," the Archbishop on his trial distinctly denies having any intimacy with him.

The remarks of Dr. Waterland on Davenport's work have been already quoted ;† and it would be easy to add other similar testimonies. It can hardly be necessary therefore to enter further upon the discussion of a work of this kind, which Laud himself discountenanced and refused to allow to be printed.

The other case is thus noticed,—"The other work to which I have referred, as bearing upon the subject of Mr. Newman's Tract, is called "An Essay towards Catholic Communion, by a Minister of the Church of England." It was published in 1715; and, being avowedly an attempt towards reconciliation with Rome, attracted, as was natural at that particular time, the notice of the government. A warrant appears to have been issued from the Secretary of State's office for the seizure of the author's papers, and the arrest of his person; under a suspicion apparently, that he was in league with the Pretender. It was more than insinuated by adverse parties, that he was actually in communion with Rome at the time; but the internal evidence of his book is, in the opinion of competent and most impartial judges whom I have consulted, so strongly the other way, that I am bound, in honesty as well as charity, to give him credit for his professions. The object of this writer is to show, by quotations from the works of approved divines of the Church of England, especially Bishops Andrewes, Forbes, and Mountague, the coincidence between the statements of our own

* History of his Troubles, p. 335. † See p. 91 above.

theologians, and the authoritative declarations of the Council of Trent, upon various points of doctrine and practice; as, for instance, the Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Intermediate State, Intercession for the Dead, and the Reverence due to Images and Relics. Accordingly this Essay is alone enough to take from the present undertaking all pretension to originality. However, my object, so far, falls short of that of this writer, that, while he seems to consider that the Church of England *teaches* certain doctrines, all at which I aim, is to show, that she cannot be *proved to repudiate them*. And of this Essay, ingenious and (on the whole) conclusive as it is, I am ready to admit that it seems to me, for the reason I have just given, partial if not disingenuous. Also I will add, that in the extracts which the writer has made from the works of English theologians, (the most important of which, I have verified, and find correct,) he has not always been sufficiently observant of collateral qualifications in the context of what he cites. Altogether, then, I will say of this very curious book, that, while no person ought to take any decisive step in the present controversy, till he has carefully read, and fairly weighed it; I am, for my own part, inclined to dispense with the evidence which it furnishes to the point of these observations, from feeling, not so much, I may sincerely say, that it is questionable, as that it is superfluous. The extract which, among others, I am about to make in support of the statement to the proof of which these observations are directed, shall come from a quarter which there can be no difficulty in admitting. It shall come, not from this Catholic Essay, but from the Anglican Reply to it. Of this, then, I will now say a few words. The Essay in question is accompanied by Observations, intended (according to the profession of the title page) to 'detect the mystery, and to expose and defeat the design, of the original work.' The writer of these observations evidently supposed that the author of the Essay was a Roman Catholic in disguise, and, accordingly, he does not spare him. He, then, at least, must be considered an impartial witness: yet we shall presently see, how far even *he* goes on the side of the Tract.

The 'Observations' in question I have been enabled to trace to Nathaniel Spinckes, A.M., Rector of Peakirk cum Glynton, in the county of Northampton, and diocese of Peterborough, and of St. Martin, Sarum, and also Prebendary of that Cathedral; of which dignity he was deprived, in the episcopate of Bishop Burnet, A.D. 1690, on the ground of his refusal to take the oaths to King William III." (pp. 52-4.) And with these remarks is introduced at p. 66, from the "Observations" above mentioned, a passage in favor of "prayers for the dead."

I have given the passage relating to this subject entire, lest I should make any omission of which Mr. Oakeley could complain. A more extraordinary mis-statement of facts (unintentional no doubt, but culpably careless) I have scarcely ever met with. The "Essay" here referred to (of which, by the way, the correct title is, "An Essay towards a proposal for Catholic Communion," and the date of publication not 1715, but 1704,) could hardly, under the circumstances of its calling forth a Secretary of State's warrant for the arrest of the author and the seizure of his papers, be of much value to Mr. Oakeley as a precedent, whoever might be its author. But, no doubt, if it was written, as it professes to be, both in the title and the body of the work, "by a minister of the Church of England," it would afford a sort of precedent for his views. If, however, it was by a Romanist, it comes to us with a falsehood on its very title, and "the internal evidence," on which the "competent" and "impartial judges" relied, is evidence of nothing but deliberate deceit and fraud. Now there really is no difficulty in ascertaining the name of the author. The Roman Catholic historian Dod has given it to us;* and told us that it was Thomas Dean of University College, Oxford; who, as Anthony a Wood in his "Athenæ Oxonienses" informs us, being a Roman Catholic Fellow of University College, withdrew from Oxford with John Massey, the Rom. Cath. Dean of Christ Church, in 1688, on the arrival of the Prince of Orange, and went over to France. Mr. Oakeley is altogether mistaken therefore in

* Certamen utrinsque Ecclesiæ, p. 16. I suppose he also mentions it in his "History," but I have not the work at hand to refer to.

supposing that it was written by one in the ministry of the Church of England ; and the mistake is of consequence, because it involves the supposition of a precedent for a case that is wholly unprecedented. And the work being written by a Romanist in disguise, pretending to be a minister of the Church of England, is altogether without weight.

But Mr. Oakeley says, he will not rely upon this Essay, but quote "from a quarter which there can be *no difficulty in admitting,*" namely "*the Anglican* Reply to it," that is, the "Observations" which were published upon it, which, he tells us, he has "been *enabled to trace* to Nathaniel Spinckes" a Nonjuror.

Now in the first place, if the "Observations" *had* been written by Spinckes, the work of a Nonjuror would have had little right to the title of "*the Anglican* Reply." How Mr. Oakeley has "been enabled to trace" them to him, I must leave to him to explain. He found, I suppose, that Spinckes had written an answer to the "Essay," and that the "Observations" were written as an answer, and hence jumped, in true Tractarian style, to the conclusion that the "Observations" were written by Spinckes.* The fact is, that if he had *even read* the "Observations," he would have found that they were not written by Spinckes. For by p. 181 it appears, that the author was the person spoken of in the "Essay"† under the terms, "Mr. St.;" and also that he was the author of the "Letter to a Missioner," known to have been written by a person of the name of "Edward Stephens."‡ And we are informed by Dod in the work already quoted, that the "Essay" was answered by a writer of the name of "Stephens." Who,

* The title of this Work is,—"An Essay towards a Proposal for Catholic Communion . . . . . fairly and impartially considered . . . . . in certain necessary Observations upon the Title, Preface, and from Chapter to Chapter to the Conclusion. Lond. 1705." 8vo.

† See p. 172 of the reprint in the "Observations."

‡ I am not sure that this pamphlet was published with his name, but it is acknowledged by him as his, in another pamphlet (p. 54) published with his name, entitled, "A true Account of the unaccountable Dealings of some Roman Catholic Missionars of this Nation. Lond. 1703." 4to.

then, was this Edward Stephens? By a pamphlet published with his name attached to it in 1703,* it appears that he was not even in the communion of the Church of England, but that he had formed a little party of his own, on the model, as he conceived, of the primitive Church. † And by his own confession in this work, ‡ he was accused of being too favourable to the Papists.

Of course, therefore, the author of the "Observations" is a most unfit person to be called as a witness, to testify the views of the Church of England. In fact, his own words, at the close of his Preface to the "Observations," might have shown Mr. Oakeley (had he read the work) that this was the case. "God himself knows," he says, "that what I heretofore writ, *seeming to many against the Church of England*, was purely for his service, and the service of my country, and of the Church of England itself: and that what I have since done *in treating with those of the Roman Communion here*, was in all sincerity for his service, and for the service of his true Holy Catholic Communion. And in all, *I have been so conducted* through so many surprising unforeseen occurrences all tending to the same end, by true catholic principles, *to the most true Catholic Communion*, by Communicating Letters, that is now in the world, that should I be insensible of a Divine Hand in it, I should be a fool or a brute," &c.: his "most true Catholic Communion" being (as is not uncommon with similar fanatics) a little knot of people following his own devices.

And it is remarkable, that in his "True Account" (p. 6,) he notices his own views on the subject for which he is quoted by Mr. Oakeley (p. 66,) under the name of Spinckes,—namely, Prayers for the dead,—as one reason for which some accused him of Popery.

Let us now pass on to the work *really* written by Spinckes, and published *with his name attached to it*; § and although it

* "A true Account of the unaccountable Dealings of some Roman Catholic Missionars of this Nation. Lond. 1703." 4to.

† See pp. 4; 25; 57, 8.

‡ P. 6.

§ The Essay towards a proposal for Catholic Communion, &c. lately published by a (pretended) Minister of the Church of England, printed at large, and answered

can hardly be properly designated as "the Anglican Reply," its author being a Nonjuror, and therefore not bound by the Anglican standards of doctrine, and open to the possibility of participating in the semi-popish views of some of his fellow-nonjurors, it is one which upon the whole is well worth the reader's attention; and in the part referring to the subject for which he is quoted by Mr. Oakeley, Prayers for the dead, his remarks are *directly opposed* to those ascribed to him, quoted from the "Observations."

The passage is this,—"Though praying for the dead be an ancient custom, practised at least in some part of the Church (if we may rely upon Tertullian for it) in his time; yet having no manner of foundation in Scripture, our Reformers therefore upon good grounds thought fit to lay it aside, as no part of Christianity. And I do not find anything yet offered, that gives just reason to endeavour the restoring it amongst us. It is a hard case when Christians must be sent for instruction in their religion, not to the doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, nor to Moses and the prophets, not to the holy canonical Scriptures either of the Old or New Testament, nor so much as to the writings of any that were contemporary with the Apostles, but to the history of the Maccabees, the Books whereof are of no authority, nor ever were received into the Jewish canon, nor any way confirmed by the doctrine of the New Testament, and which, as Bishop Cosins has most convincingly proved, was never any part of the Christian canon; and to a passage in one of these Books, which, were it canonical Scripture, would never answer the end for which it is produced. . . . . But it seems, Bishop Barrow of St. Asaph, and Mr. Thorndike (to whom he adds Bishop Forbes) approved of this practice. As to the two former, they were great men, but yet they stood *divided from the rest of our Church in this point*, and are no examples for us to follow any further than it shall appear they had reason and truth on their

chapter by chapter. Whereby it appears that the author's method of reconciling the church of England with that of Rome is fallacious, and his design impracticable. By N. Spinckes, a Presbyter of the Church of England. Lond. 1705. 8vo.

side, *which in this case they had not.* This I say, supposing they were for this sort of prayers. That they were, he thinks he has proved from their epitaphs of their own appointment.* But what sort of proof is this? The Bishop desires us only to pray in the words of St. Paul for Onesiphorus, that he *may find mercy in that day.* The other seems to have meant something more, and therein, as I said, is singular, and yet is of no use to our author, because he has not one tittle of Purgatory or any deliverance from it. To these he subjoins Bishop Forbes, who it must be confessed has shown himself a favourer of prayers for the dead; yet not of such as are in use in the Church of Rome. For after all he concludes, that 'the opinions of souls being delivered out of Purgatory, by the prayers and oblations that are made for them, neither had nor could have any place in the Church, till after the end of the fourth century.' (De Purgatorio, c. 3. s. 32.) And indeed it had not till a long time after. So that the most our author has to say for himself as to this point, is, that he has found two in our Church, and one in the Church of Scotland, that seem to have been of opinion for praying for the dead; but none of them in such a form as his Church does. And hence he is pleased to conclude, that 'here are grounds laid for a good accommodation;' that is to say, here are three persons that say what neither his Church nor ours would be content with; not his, because they do not speak home enough, nor ours, because they speak too much for us, though not enough for them; and who consequently persuade neither. In short, this method of praying for the dead may have an appearance of charity, but IS NOT TO BE JUSTIFIED, because, though of ancient use in the Christian Church, yet *was it not from the beginning, and so is not old enough.* Nor will his fifth rule prove, that this may not be insisted upon as one just cause of the difference betwixt ours and the Roman Church, namely, that though granted *not* to be *in Scripture, yet it is not contrary to, or forbid in Scripture;* this being a rule that holds well in matters of decency and order, but is not to

* Chalmers in his Biographical Dictionary says he can find no authority for the statement that Bishop Barrow's epitaph was drawn up by the Bishop himself.

be extended so as to introduce any *unscriptural species or form of worship.*"*

If we were considering our present subject *dogmatically* instead of *only historically*, there are many other passages from this work which we should be glad to place before the reader; but it must suffice here, to commend the treatise to his notice.

The *real* work of Spinckes, then, is entirely opposed to Mr. Oakeley's views. And I cannot but here remark, in passing on, that it is exceedingly painful to have to deal with a series of mis-statements such as we have had to encounter in the work under review; and difficult to combine the courtesy it is desired to show towards the author with the language of reprobation which they deserve. It is no light matter, to fling random statements like these before the public on a subject of such serious and practical importance, and repeat them, after three years time for inquiry, with the boast that they have been found unanswerable. And mournful is the reflection, how many have been misled by them; and induced to embrace views which no subsequent discovery of the erroneousness of the arguments by which they were persuaded, will cause them to give up. When designs are contemplated such as those of Mr. Newman and Mr. Oakeley, it is but little to expect, that no pains shall be spared to ascertain, and correctly represent, the true state of the case with respect to the facts upon which the proof of the truth of their views is made to rest. And yet each statement, as it comes, seems only to bring fresh evidence of the recklessness with which things are misrepresented so as to prop up the monstrous hypothesis sought to be established. And so we shall find it to be to the end.

Mr. Oakeley speaks of the two instances he has mentioned of an attempt in this country of a character somewhat similar to Tract xc., as two "among others." It would have been well if he had at least given some brief reference to these "others." The only others worth noticing that have come under my observation are two which will hardly I think render him any service.

* Pp. 170-3.

One is, an anonymous Popish Tract published in the course of the controversy between the Romanists and Protestants in this country in the time of James II., entitled "An agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome evinced, &c. Lond. 1687." 4to.; in which however the author "confines himself to matters of government and worship," and therefore does not touch upon the principal points now under discussion. The work was fully answered both by Dr. Sherlock afterwards Dean of St. Paul's,* and by John Williams afterwards Bishop of Chichester.† In the reply of the latter, the differences between the two Churches, especially in matters of doctrine, are fully stated.

The other is, the "Commonitorium" of Dr. Du Pin, a review of the Thirty-nine Articles drawn up in consequence of a correspondence between himself and another Doctor of the Sorbonne on one side, and Archbishop Wake on the other, on the subject of a union between the English and Gallican Churches. A full account of the "Commonitorium" and of this correspondence, is given in the fourth Appendix of Maclaine's translation of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History.‡ This project of a union between the two Churches was, it appears, started by some Doctors of the Sorbonne,§ and the "Commonitorium" was sent over to Archbishop Wake to show the views of those who entertained it respecting the Thirty-nine Articles.

But this work will not advance Mr. Oakeley's cause a single step, for neither was Dr. Du Pin satisfied with the Articles, nor Archbishop Wake with Dr. Du Pin's "Commonitorium."

For instance, on the 14th Article, on "Works of supererogation," Dr. Du Pin "observes, 'that works of supererogation mean only works conducive to salvation, which are not matters of strict precept, but of counsel only; that the word, being

* In,—"A vindication of some Protestant principles of church unity and catholic communion from the charge of agreement with the Church of Rome. In answer, &c. Lond. 1688." 4to. reprinted in Bishop Gibson's Preservative.

† In,—"The difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in opposition to a late book, &c. Lond. 1687." 4to. likewise reprinted in Bishop Gibson's Preservative, vol. iii.

‡ I quote from the edition of 1826 in six vols. 8vo. See vol. vi.

§ Ib. p. 131.

new, may be rejected, *provided it be owned, that the faithful do some such works.*'" * On the 25th, "he insists that the five Romish sacraments be acknowledged as such, whether instituted immediately by Christ, or not."† "He proposes expressing the part of the 28th that relates to Transubstantiation (which term he is willing to omit entirely), in the following manner: 'That the bread and wine *are really changed into the body and blood of Christ*, which last are truly and really received by all, though none but the faithful partake of any benefit from them.' This extends also to the 29th Article."‡ "He is less inclined to concessions on the 31st Article, and maintains that the sacrifice of Christ is not only commemorated, but *continued*, in the Eucharist, and that every communicant offers him along with the priest."§

On the receipt of this "Commonitorium," the Archbishop writes thus to Mr. Beauvoir, chaplain to the English ambassador at Paris, (who had first brought the subject before him);—"I cannot tell well what to say to Dr. Du Pin. If he thinks we are to take their direction what to retain, and what to give up, he is utterly mistaken. I am a friend to peace, but *more to truth* . . . . As to my desire of peace and union with all other Christian Churches, I am still the same: but with the doctor's *Commonitorium* I shall never comply. The matter must be put into another method; and, whatever they think, they *must alter some of their doctrines, and practices too*, or an union with them can never be effected . . . . . I have now plainly opened my mind to you: you will communicate no more of it than is fitting to the two Doctors, but keep it as a testimony of my sincerity in this affair; and that I have no design, but what is consistent with the honour and freedom of our English Church, and with *the security of that true and sound doctrine which is taught in it, and from which no consideration shall ever make me depart.*" ‖

The design of course, as the Archbishop expected,¶ came to nothing.

* Maclaine's Mosheim, vol. vi. p. 140. † Ib. p. 142.
‡ Ib. p. 142. § Ib. p. 142. ‖ Ib. pp. 161, 2. ¶ Ib. pp. 138 and 162.

The view which the Archbishop took of some of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, we shall have occasion to notice hereafter.

IV. The last part of Mr. Oakeley's proof consists of extracts from the works of a few individual divines, who have (he contends) supported Roman doctrine; namely, W. Forbes, bishop of Aberdeen, Bishop Andrews, Bishop Mountague and Thorndike.

But in the first place, if it were true, that these divines *had* maintained Roman doctrine on one or two points, (which is all that is alleged,) this would be far from affording a precedent for the position maintained by Mr. Oakeley and his party; nor would the Church of England be at all committed by the fact, that such passages might be found in the writings of some of her divines. Even as to the particular points on which he has adduced their testimony, (supposing him to be correct in his representation of their views, *which is not the case*,) it is far from being a sufficient defence to say, Here are three or four divines of our Church, who subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, publicly teaching certain Roman doctrines; therefore I may consistently with my subscription hold those doctrines, and even "all Roman doctrine." All manner of heresies might be defended in this way; for it is morally impossible, that, during a period of three centuries, the Church should be uniformly and ceaselessly preserved in such a state of purity that no errors could be found in the writings of her divines uncensured. Nor is it, indeed, possible, or desirable, that every erroneous or Romish statement of even eminent men should be *invariably* visited with the public judicial censure of the Church.

Moreover, one of the parties here appealed to is not an admissible witness on the question at issue; namely, Bishop Forbes; for he was a bishop of the Scotch Church, and therefore not bound by the Thirty-nine Articles. However, as Mr. Oakeley has referred us to his testimony, we will not shrink from the consideration of it; and will take his case first.

The work of Bishop Forbes which is here referred to, is, his

" Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ Controversiarum," (published London, 1658, 8vo.) which treats of Justification, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Christ the Mediator, and the Eucharist. It is said by Mr. Oakeley (p. 55), that this work is " avowedly an attempt to effect a reconciliation with Rome on the basis of the common Catholic faith." But this is far from being a correct statement of the case. The work is nothing more than an attempt to clear what the author conceived to be the true doctrine on the points treated of, of the mistakes and misapprehensions both of Romanists and Protestants. He cannot therefore be quoted as a maintainer of Roman doctrine, as in various places he expressly repudiates it. And singularly enough one of these is in one of the passages given in the work under review, that on purgatory (pp. 72, 73), where he says,— " Ad controversiam hanc tollendam, vel saltem minuendam, Romanenses opinionem suam de Purgatorio punitivo, quum nullis certis fundamentis, nec in Scripturis, nec in primorum seculorum Patribus, nec in Priscis Conciliis, nitatur, ut supra demonstratum est, pro fidei articulo nec habeant ipsimet, neque aliis obtrudant." (Consid. p. 266.) And so elsewhere he says,—" Multa in Patrum scriptis legere est, quæ ad purgatorium Romanensium refellendum clarissime faciunt." (Ib. p. 239.) " Sententia de liberatione animarum ex pœnis purgatoriis per orationes et oblationes pro illis factas, locum in Ecclesia non habuit, neque etiam habere potuit, nisi circa annum Christi quadringentesimum, ut supra dictum." (Ib. p. 256.) " Quod autem ad extrahendas defunctorum animas e flammis purgatorii sacrificia missarum exiguntur, et quidem sæpe repetita, otiosorum hominum et simplicitate populorum ad quæstum suum male abutentium, commentum est. Longe alias ob fines oratum et oblatum pro mortuis in veteri Ecclesia, ut contra Romanenses fuse ostendimus, quum de Purgatorio et oratione pro defunctis ageremus." (Ib. p. 464.)

Moreover, on the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Eucharist, what he contends for is clearly different from the Roman doctrine, for he *limits* the propitiatory character of the eucharistic sacrifice thus,—he says it is propitiatory, " quomodo oratio, cujus

hoc sacrificium species est, propitiatoria dici potest." (p. 460, quoted in the pamphlet, p. 65; and again, p. 465, quoted ib., p. 66.)

And again as it respects the invocation of saints, for which doctrine he is quoted by Mr. Oakeley, (pp. 68, 69,) though he goes further than Protestants generally, in allowing a certain kind of addresses being made to them, yet he distinctly objects to such addresses being considered a religious act;—"Invocationem angelorum et sanctorum plurimi Romanensium actum esse religionis, seu religiosi cultus, vel duliæ religiosæ, et orationem ad eos religiosam esse affirmare haud verentur. . . . . Adorationem tamen religiosam, *quocunque insigniatur nomine, sive latriæ sive douliæ, soli Deo deberi*, pariter et omnes illius actus atque officia, clarissime docent tam Scripturæ quam Patres, quamadmodum Protestantes copiose demonstrarunt; quos, lector benevole, consule." (pp. 292, 3.)

Whatever, then, may be thought of the views entertained by Bishop Forbes, he cannot be quoted as maintaining *Roman* doctrine on these points. Whether they were thoroughly sound views, and what is commonly understood by the phrase orthodox Protestantism, is another question. But they will not help Mr. Oakeley.

The next divine referred to, is Bishop Andrews, who will still less answer Mr. Oakeley's purpose.

He quotes him first, (p. 63,) as admitting that the eucharist is "a commemorative sacrifice for quick and dead." This, however, is not a correct representation of his words. All that he grants, is, that the eucharist is "a sacrifice," which he explains afterwards as meaning what is implied in the words of Augustine, that the sacrifice of Christ's death "celebratur per *sacramentum memoriæ*" in the eucharist, and that the eucharist may be "considered as a sacrifice in the representation of the breaking the bread and pouring forth the cup;" and that "*the sacrifice of Christ's death* is available for present, absent, living, dead, yea for them that are yet unborn." He does not say that the eucharistic or commemorative sacrifice is available for the dead. And in granting that the eucharist is a comme-

morative sacrifice, he by no means grants the Roman doctrine on the subject. "It is acknowledged on all hands," says Spinckes, in the work already quoted, "that this Sacrament is a Commemoration of our Saviour's offering himself upon the cross, and appointed by our Blessed Saviour himself to this very purpose; and so has been figuratively called a Sacrifice, a Commemorative, as I said before, and Eucharistical Sacrifice. And this we readily agree to. But this will not suffice, for the Council of Trent anathematizes such as proceed no further." (p. 142.)

As it respects "prayer for the dead," though indeed Bishop Andrews says, (p. 9.) as Mr. Oakeley quotes him, that "there is *little* to be said against it; it cannot be denied but that it is ancient," yet he expressly mentions it (p. 22) as a point in which "we," that is, we of the respective Churches of England and Rome, "*vary*" from each other.

He next quotes him (p. 72) on "the reverence due to relics." But so far from supporting Roman doctrine on this subject, he expressly opposes it; and all that he admits is, that if he knew the relics to be genuine, he would carry to them the regard that became him. And who would deny, that such relics deserved respectful treatment? But Bishop Andrews probably would have agreed with King James, where he says,—"For reliques of saints, if I had any such that I were assured were members of their bodies, I would *honourably bury them*, and not give them the reward of condemned men's members, which are only ordained to be deprived of burial." *

Lastly, he quotes him (p. 73), as upholding the seven sacraments of Rome, whereas all that he says, *even in the words quoted by Mr. Oakeley*, is, that "the title of sacrament hath sometimes been given by the Fathers unto all the five *in a larger signification*, but so also to *many things more*." And this no one denies.

But the truth is, that this passage of Bishop Andrews has been mangled in a way of which it is difficult to know how to

* Premonition, &c., Works, p. 305.

speak. *The middle of the paragraph, containing precisely the part which shows his opposition to Roman doctrine, has been cut out; and the beginning and end joined together.*

Mr. Oakeley gives it thus,—"'We deny not but that the title of sacrament hath sometimes been given by the Fathers unto all the Five in a larger signification. But so also to many things more; the whole matter is a mere λογομαχια.' Answer to Card. Perron."

Now the words of Bishop Andrews are these,—"We deny not, but that the title of sacrament hath sometimes been given by the Fathers unto all these five, in a larger signification. But so is it also to many things more: and namely (as it is alleged after by the Cardinal in the xvii. head) salt is called a sacrament: sacramentum catechumenis non detur, nisi solitum sal. (Con. Carthag. III. c. 5.) *But* POUR VRAYE ET PROPRE SACRAMENT, [quoting the Cardinal's words] *there is not any of the Fathers so affirms any of the five.* The whole matter is a mere λογομαχια. *If the thing were agreed upon,* we should not strive for the name." (pp. 11, 12.) *

Thus, instead of agreeing with, he *directly opposes* the Roman doctrine in this passage.

The passage is very similar to one in the Homily, "Of Common Prayer and Sacraments."†

And, as we shall see hereafter, he expressly charges the Church of Rome with idolatry.

Another of the divines referred to as affording a precedent in favour of Mr. Oakeley, is Bishop Mountague;‡ of whose case, indeed, he ventures to say, that it "amounts to something very like an authoritative decision, on the part of the then Church of England, in favour of the consistency of certain very close approximations to Roman doctrine, with the

* The treatise from which these quotations are made is entitled, "Strictura; or, a brief answer to the 18th chapter of the first book of Cardinal Perron's Reply written in French, to King James—his Answer written by Mr. Casaubon in Latin;" published in Bishop Andrews's "Opuscula quædam posthuma. Lond. 1629." 4to.

† p. 388, of ed. already quoted. ‡ See pp. 19, 20; 43; 67—84.

language of her formularies; such decision having been pronounced, after a careful deliberation, by a committee of bishops, appointed by the king to represent the national Church;"* and he quotes him as defending Roman doctrine on various points. †

This, no doubt, is a case which, if there were any among us that would serve as a precedent for Mr. Newman and Mr. Oakeley and their party, might bid the fairest for being so. But when examined, it will be found wholly to fail them.

For it will appear,

First, that Mountague is expressly and in terms an opponent of Roman doctrine, and all which he considered to be characteristically Roman doctrine, including the very points in which he is quoted by Mr. Oakeley as supporting it.

Secondly, that where he may be considered as approaching it, and swerving from the strict doctrine of the Church of England, he repudiates the charge of doing so; and that such points are matters rather indirectly than directly determined in the Articles.

Thirdly, that the committee of divines that reported on his case have not the slightest right to be considered as a body representing the Church of England.

Fourthly, that the decision given was not one that wholly exculpated him; nor did he escape censure, for so expressing himself as to raise questions and disputes in the Church, instead of abiding by the standard of doctrine delivered in the Thirty-nine Articles, his "Appeal" being suppressed by authority on this ground.

These points I shall now endeavour to establish; only remarking first, that as to any *secret* leanings he might have (and probably had at a subsequent period, ‡) towards Romanism, we have nothing to do with such matters here. We must judge of his case here by his public acts, as by these alone the cause of the Church of England can be affected.

First, then, he is expressly and in terms an opponent of

* pp. 19, 20. † See pp. 67—76.

‡ See Memoirs of Panzani, edited by Berrington. Birm. 1793, 8vo.

Roman doctrine, and all which he considered to be characteristically Roman doctrine, including the very points in which he is quoted by Mr. Oakeley as supporting it.

The very work in which he first made the statements upon which the accusation against him of favouring various Popish views was founded,* was written in answer to an attack upon the Church of England by a Romanist, and in various places refutes the errors of the Church of Rome. Nay, this controversy between him and a Romanist arose (as he himself informs us in his Preface to this work) from his having publicly advanced and professed himself ready to defend three propositions, of which the first and third are as follows,—

"If any Papist living, or all the Papists living, can prove unto me, that the present Roman Church is either the Catholic Church, or a sound member of the Catholic Church, I will subscribe."

"If any Papist, &c., can prove unto me, that all those points, or any one of those points which *the Church of Rome maintaineth against the Church of England*, were, or was the perpetual doctrine of the Catholic Church, &c., I will subscribe."

And of the Council of Trent he says in the same Preface,— "The Councils of Trent, of Florence, of Lateran, are not all councils. We refuse them as factious, as bastards, as partiaries, as having nothing but the names of councils. . . . . We may as well press you with the synods of Gapp and Dort, as you us with Trent and divers others."

And in his Defence against the accusation of having maintained Romish errors, (entitled "Appello Cæsarem; a just appeal from two unjust informers. Lond. 1625." 4to.) he distinctly maintains the erroneous nature of what he considers characteristically Roman doctrine, and its opposition to the doctrine of the Church of England.

M. Mountague, he says, "may err, (for in many things we err all,) but will be no heretic, especially against the Church

* A Gagg for the New Gospel? No; a new Gagg for an old Goose, &c. Lond. 1624. 4to.

of England; to the doctrine whereof established he hath more than once subscribed; and *therefore disclaimeth all aspersion of Popery*, and is farther from it than any Puritan in the kingdom."*

"Upon the indictment, I plead not guilty of both accusations, of Arminianism and Popery, and call therein for trial for it by God and my country; the Scriptures, as the Rule of faith; the Church, interpreting and applying that Rule from time to time against all novellers." †

"I call God and all his holy angels to witness, I nor am, nor have been, nor intend to be hereafter, either Papist, or Romish Catholic; a Papist of state, or of religion; but a priest, a member, a follower of the Church, and doctrine of the Church of England. *The original grounds of Popery are, to my understanding, against reason, have not their warrant from revealed truth, stand not with the purer practice of prime antiquity.*"‡

"I will not deny, but the Pope is *an* Antichrist. I do not deny it. *I do believe it.* These honest informers should not so have dealt with me, as by a knack of concealment to have done me so palpable a wrong, as if my meaning were, the Pope was no Antichrist at all. So I might have walked, not only upon the brinks, but have come much within the verge of flat Popery: and not injuriously, as now, have been slandered for, and styled, a Papist. For that imputation might more than grate upon an universal approving of the total doctrine of the Church of Rome; in as much as there were of old, are now, and alway will be, many Antichrists; and he that any way opposeth Christ in his kingdom, his word, his church, is an Antichrist; *which, as ingenuously as the former, I profess the Pope and the Church of Rome doth.* And therefore when out of my private opinion only (for which I will not trouble the peace of the Church) I denied that the Pope was THAT Antichrist, then yet and there I added withall, AN *Antichrist notwithstanding I hold him or them, carrying themselves in the Church as they do.*"§

* Appello Cæsarem, &c. p. 4. † Ib. p. 9. ‡ Ib. p. 111.
§ Ib. p. 144, 5.

Nay, in the very points for which he is quoted by Mr. Oakeley as maintaining Roman doctrine, he expressly opposes it.

Thus, he is quoted first (pp. 67, 8,), as favouring the Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints, whereas a great part of the Treatise from which the extract is taken is written for the purpose of opposing that doctrine. But having remarked, that the *doctrine* of the Romish church (adding, by the way, expressly, that "concerning *practice* it is otherwise,") on this subject is, only to call upon the saints to intercede for us with God, and then observing, "This is not unlawful *in itself,*" (meaning, as the context clearly shows, that it is not unlawful for Christians to ask one another to pray for them,) Mr. Oakeley cuts these words out of their context, as a proof that he advocated the lawfulness of the Roman doctrine on this point; whereas the very words that follow, and without which his sense is incomplete, oppose that doctrine, for the passage goes on thus;—"It is no *exclusive*, Call in thy own person. For warrant and practice is for the contrary. *Orate pro invicem,* [pray for one another,] is a precept. The church prayed for Peter, there is practice. *But such mediators* THEY [*the Romanists*] *use in this case, as are supposed not to be*, apti nati: *not accommodated to the purpose, not fitted or disposed to be employed in, and therefore incapable of, that office of intercession.*"*

And so elsewhere in the same Treatise he remarks, "A main part of thankful duty unto God, and recognition of his love, is to believe his promise, and build upon his word; to follow his directions, come at his invitation; not to stand as in doubtful suspense what to do, or what course to run in time of trouble: seeing he that is able, doth declare himself willing to hear and deliver, at our call, by immediate warrant from himself, without help or mediation or suit of others. And yet the Church of Rome, having lost her first love, and long since made forfeiture of her honour, hath prostituted her devotions, even *πανδημει*:" &c †

* A Treatise of Invocation of Saints, Lond. 1624. 4to. p. 63.

† Ib. p. 57.

" Invocation of saints is a point of foolery, it being at least uncertain, whether they are, and in what manner they can be, acquainted with our wants, seeing their condition is not to attend us, and they are removed far above our reach and call, though we call unto them never so often or so loud . . . . If myself at London should say unto a friend at Constantinople, or in the Indies, Sir, help me, I might be laughed at deservedly for my folly. *This case cometh home to their practice of invocation.*"*

" How shall I inform them for my estate, or be sure I am heard when I supplicate thus, *Sancta Maria ora pro me?* She is in heaven; I upon earth . . . . . I know the saying is, that 'kings have long ears.' . . . . . But whether saints in heaven have such long ears or not, Bellarmine cannot resolve Calvin, I am sure, though he traduce him for using the phrase, as if he would embase the glory of God's saints, who meant only to show the folly of these persuaders in this particular."†

Next he is quoted (pp. 69, 70) as adopting the Roman doctrine on the " reverence due to images;" whereas in the very passages quoted he expressly opposes any *religious* reverence being paid to them, and pleads only for their civil, and moral, and historical use. And in the neighbourhood of the very passage quoted from his " Appeal,"‡ he avers that the worship of images, as required by " an article of faith in the Roman Church," is idolatrous,§ and that our Church has " departed " from the Church of Rome on that point.‖ And the *title* of his 21st chapter is, " No religious honour or worship to be given to images;"¶ and of his 22d chapter is, " Popish doctrine and practice both about adoration of images, rejected."** The only question between him and his opponents was, whether

* Ib. p. 98.

† Ib. pp. 115, 16. There are, no doubt, some peculiar notions advocated in this Treatise not generally received in the Church of England, as for instance that " it is most probable " that there are angel keepers, which however he urges not " as a point of belief or piety." (See pp. 98, 9); but these will not help Mr. Oakeley at all.

‡ Appello Cæsarem, p. 253.

§ Ib. 249.

‖ Ib. pp. 251, 2.

¶ Ib. p. 252.

** Ib. p. 256.

images might be admitted, for *historical* use, into churches; a question which, however important, is irrelevant to the present subject.

He is then quoted (p. 72), as a defender of the Roman doctrine on the reverence due to relics. And thus he speaks on this subject, in his Answer to the Gagg, showing how completely the scraps Mr. Oakeley has given from him misrepresent, by giving only *a part* of his views, his real sentiments.

"You may keep, if you will, and lock up, if you please, in your cabinet or casket, or where you will, Saint Campion's thumb, Saint Garnet's straw, Saint Loyola's hair . . . [the context is too coarse to quote,] and further take Saint Lipsius' old breeches to shrine them in: . . . . . our Lady of Sichem will perhaps lend them to so holy and devout a purpose: I know no Protestant will steal them from you."

And remarking upon the reference made by the Romanists to Exod. xiii. 19, as to Moses taking the bones of Joseph with him out of Egypt, he says,—"There was a tie upon Israel to do that which they did. Joseph dying had bound them with an oath to do so. Had our Lady so bound you for her smock or her milk, you were excused. Thirdly, they carried them thence, not to keep them, which is your tenet; much less to shrine them or adore them, which is your practice; but to bury them in the land of Canaan: which they did, Jos. xxiv. 32. *Do you in like sort, and we applaud you with your reliques.*"

"It is natural for any man to affect the remembrance or memorials of a friend; to admire and make much of rare things, not every day seen. Bring me, then, a piece of the Cross of our Saviour, one of the Nails, or some such memorial of his passion: show me Moses' rod, Saint Peter's sword, I will prize them above all the jewels I can have. Will this content you? *I know no Protestant will do less than so.* Worship them I dare not. Show them as you do, I would not. . . . In that, you *profane them to idolatry, misleading the people to adore them.* This did not antiquity, nor do we. . . . . The miracles, memories, reliques of saints in your Roman Church, are all of them known to be juggling tricks of deceiv-

ing knaves: and if Saint Martin were alive again, he might find out only one man's reliques, but many thousands to be the bones of theirs [? thieves] that died at the gallows for their sins, not of martyrs that shed their blood for Jesus." *

He is next quoted (pp. 74, 5,) as defending the Roman doctrine of "seven sacraments;" whereas all he contends for in the place quoted is, that the *name* sacrament may be given in a modified sense to other things besides baptism and the Lord's Supper, and shows that even Calvin admits that ordination may be called a sacrament.†

Lastly, he is quoted (p. 75) as holding the Roman doctrine of the inerrability of General Councils, where again he is similarly misrepresented, for in the context of the very passage quoted, he expressly and in terms opposes the Roman doctrine on the subject;‡ nor does he give the smallest countenance to the misrepresentation of the 21st Article in Tract xc., for all that he contends for is, that Councils *truly general* will never err in *fundamentals*, expressly limiting that inerrability to fundamentals; and remarking, "Nor do I resolve it as *certum et de fide*, or tender it unto others to be believed. I say no more, but 'I see no cause why I may not so resolve:' *and that also but upon suppositions, if the Council be truly* GENERAL *indeed*." §

Such is the testimony of Bishop Mountague on the very points in which he is referred to by Mr. Oakeley as supporting Roman doctrine!

Secondly; where he may be considered as approaching Roman doctrine, and swerving from the strict doctrine of the Church of England, he repudiates the charge of doing so; and such points are matters rather indirectly than directly determined in the Articles.

That he *did* repudiate such a charge, and therefore stood in a very different position to that maintained by Mr. Newman,

* A Gagg for the new Gospel? No; &c. Lond. 1624. 4to. pp. 230; 237; 238, 9.

† See his "Appello Cæsarem," c. 33, pp. 305, 6.

‡ Ib. pp. 121, 2. § Ib. p. 122.

Mr. Oakeley, and others, is clear from the passages already quoted from him. That the points *really* involved in the statements objected to in his writings, (however likely some parts might be to lead into error,) were, *when his statements were taken as a whole,* rather indirectly than directly determined in the Articles; and that (to say nothing of mistaken charges) some, in fact, were points upon which the Church had not pronounced a decision,—will appear to any one who reads the account of the charge made against him, as quoted by Mr. Oakeley himself.*

Thirdly; the committee of divines that reported on his case have not the slightest right to be considered as a body representing the Church of England.

The case was this. The House of Commons having complained of Mountague, the king appointed a committee of six bishops, Andrews of Winchester, Montaigne of London, Neyle of Durham, Buckeridge of Rochester, Howson of Oxford, and Laud (then) of St. Davids, *to give him their judgment on his case.* It is obvious (without going into any considerations as to the motives which governed this selection) that such a body has not the smallest title to be spoken of in such terms as Mr. Oakeley has used respecting them.

Fourthly; the decision given was not one that wholly exculpated him; nor did he escape censure, for so expressing himself as to raise questions and disputes in the Church, instead of abiding by the standard of doctrine delivered in the Thirty-nine Articles, his "Appeal" being suppressed by authority on this ground.

The phraseology of the report of the committee is remarkable. They find that "Mr. Mountague, in his Book, hath not *affirmed anything to be the doctrine of the Church of England,* but that which in our opinions is the doctrine of the Church of England, or agreeable thereunto." Why this might be true of anybody, Papist, Mohammedan, or Pagan, who knew theoretically what the doctrine of the Church of England was.

* Pp. 78—81. Cited from the "Biographia Britannica," vol. v. p. 3186.

The question was, whether he had *maintained* doctrines opposed to, or not conformable with, those of the Church of England, not whether he had affirmed them to be the doctrines of *the Church* of England; and upon this question they are silent. But Mountague was Laud's friend, and he was to be brought off in the best way that could be devised. However, he does not wholly escape indirect censure, for it is immediately added,—"And for the preservation of the peace of the Church, we in humility do conceive, That his Majesty shall do most graciously to prohibit all parties, members of the Church of England, any further controverting of those questions by public preaching, or writing, or any other way, to the disturbance of the peace of this Church for the time to come. And for anything that may further concern Mr. Mountague's person in that business, we humbly commend him to his Majesty's gracious favour and PARDON." *

And for the further history of the case, the most authentic testimony is that given by the king himself, in his "Declaration to his subjects of the causes which moved him to dissolve the Parliament," dated March 2, 1628-9; where he says,—"We found in the first place, that much exception had been taken at a book intituled *Appello Cæsarem*, or, An Appeal to Cæsar, and published in the year 1625, by Richard Mountague, then bachelor of divinity, and now bishop of Chichester: and because it did *open the way to those schisms and divisions which have since ensued in the Church*, we did, for remedy and redress thereof, and for satisfaction of the consciences of our good people, not only by our public Proclamation *call in that book*, which ministered *matter of offence;* but to prevent *the like danger for hereafter*, reprinted the Articles of religion established in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory; and by a Declaration before those Articles, we did tie and restrain all opinions to the sense of those Articles, that nothing might be left for *private fancies and innovation*. For we call God to record, before whom we stand, that it is, and always hath been, our heart's desire, to be found worthy of that title

* Mr. Oakeley on Tract xc., pp. 83, 4.

which we account the most glorious in all our crown, *Defender of the faith:* neither shall we ever give way to the authorizing of anything whereby any innovation may steal or creep into the Church, but preserve that unity of doctrine and discipline established in the time of Queen Elizabeth, whereby the Church of England hath stood and flourished ever since. And as we were careful to make up all breaches and rents in religion at home, so did we, by our Proclamation and commandment for the execution of laws against priests and popish recusants, fortify all ways and approaches against *that foreign enemy;*" &c. *

Thus, notwithstanding the powerful patronage by which he was supported on the part of some influential men, as desirous of altering the tone of the Church's doctrine on some points as himself, his book was "called in" by public proclamation, and he is here referred to as one who had disturbed the peace of the Church by his "private fancies and innovation;" and, *with especial reference to his case*, the Thirty-nine Articles are republished with a Declaration prefixed to them restraining all opinions to their sense.

So much for this vaunted case of Bishop Mountague. And I will only add, that if any one wishes to know more of the real character of this person, and how far he deserves to be referred to as a son of the Church of England, I refer him to Panzani's Memoirs, mentioned above.

There remains only for consideration the case of Thorndike. Mr. Oakeley quotes him as supporting the Roman doctrine on the subjects of prayers for the dead, (p. 64,) the reverence due to images, (p. 70,) and seven sacraments, (p. 73.)

As it respects the first of these the statement is correct; almost the first correct statement we have found throughout the whole work. But, as Mr. Oakeley admits, Thorndike himself cautions us against supposing that such a practice implies the Romish doctrine of purgatory; which he condemns; and therefore at best his case in this point is of little use to our opponents. In fact, what does it prove even for the doctrine which he advocates?

* Works of King Charles I. (1662. fol.) Part 2, p. 19.

Are we to conclude that it was the doctrine of the Church of England, because he was never publicly censured for maintaining it? Obviously not. Nor does it by any means follow, that because one or two individuals, making isolated statements of this kind, have happened, from one cause or another, to escape censure, therefore such statements are entitled to free currency in our Church. What says Mr. Oakeley's own referee (or rather, intended referee) Spinckes on this very matter, when the author of the "Essay" referred to Bishop Barrow and Thorndike as supporters of prayers for the dead? "They were great men," he remarks, "but yet *they stood divided from the rest of our Church in this point,* and are no examples for us to follow any further than it shall appear they had reason and truth on their side, *which in this case they had not.*" *

As it respects the question of the seven sacraments, he gives the *name* to the five about which there is a dispute, only in the sense in which the Fathers did; in which we have seen Calvin himself using the name.

As to his holding the Roman doctrine on the reverence due to images, whatever the passage may show as to his notions of the harmlessness of the historical use of images in churches, and however unsatisfactorily it may be worded, it does not appear from it, that he held the Roman doctrine on the subject. And we have his own testimony in a document written but a few years after, and preserved to us by Bishop Stillingfleet, that he did not hold that doctrine, but on the contrary entirely condemned it. This document (in which the matter now in question is the thirteenth point noticed,) is so important in relation to our present subject that I shall give it entire as published by the bishop.* It is a paper containing his judgment of the Church of Rome, delivered by him to a Lady a little before his death; from whom, the bishop tells us, it came "immediately" to his hands. It is as follows;—

* Essay towards a proposal for Catholic Communion Answered, &c. Lond. 1705. 8vo. p. 172.

† In his,—Several Conferences between a Romish priest, a fanatic chaplain, and a divine of the Church of England, concerning the idolatry of the Church of Rome. Lond. 1679. 8vo. pp. 85, et seq.

" 1. The truth of the Christian religion, and of the Scripture is presupposed to the being of a Church,

" And therefore cannot depend upon the authority of it

" 2. The Church of Rome maintains the decrees of the present Church to be infallible, which is false and yet concerns the salvation of all that believe it,

" Therefore no man can submit to the authority of it.

" 3. The Church of Rome in St. Jerome's time, did not make void the baptism of those sects which did not baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,

" But that baptism is void and true baptism necessary to salvation.

" Therefore the Church of Rome may err in matters of salvation.

" 4. The Church of Rome may err in schism, following the wrong cause. If you except only things necessary to salvation to be believed. This shows that infallibility only in things necessary to salvation is not enough. It is destructive to salvation to follow the wrong cause in schism.

" Instance. The Schism with the Greek Church for appeals to Rome. For there is evident Tradition to the contrary.

" 5. The Church of Rome enjoins Apocryphal Scriptures to be esteemed canonical Scriptures.

" But this injunction is contrary to Tradition and truth, and concerns the salvation of all that receive it.

" 6. The Church of Rome in St. Jerome's time did not receive the Epistle to the Hebrews for canonical Scripture, as now it doth, and as in truth it is,

" Therefore the Church of Rome may err in declaring the authority of Scripture.

" 7. The Church of Rome doth err in teaching that attrition is turned into contrition by submitting to the power of the Keys;

" But this error is destructive to the salvation of all that believe it.

" Therefore it may err in matters necessary to salvation.

" That it is an error. Because of the condition of remission of sins, which is before the being of a Church; and therefore cannot depend on the authority of the Church.

" 8. The Church of Rome enjoineth to believe Transubstantiation, and to profess that which is false. For there is Scripture and Tradition for the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist; but neither Scripture nor Tradition for transubstantiation, viz. for abolishing the Elements,

" But the Church of Rome enjoins to believe it.

" Therefore it enjoins to believe that for which there is neither Tradition nor Scripture. Witness the Fathers that own the elements after consecration.

" 9. The Council of Trent enjoineth to believe that Christ instituted a new Passover to be sacrificed as well as represented, commemorated, and offered in the Eucharist, *de sacrific. Missæ. cap.* i. which is false,

" For the sacrifice of Christ's cross is commemorated, represented, and offered as ready to be slain in and by the Eucharist; but not slain, and therefore not sacrificed in it and by celebrating it.

" And therefore when it is said there, c. 11, *quod in Missa Christus incruentè immolatur*, if it be meant *properly*, it is a *contradiction*; for that which hath blood is not sacrificed but by shedding the blood of it; if *figuratively*, it signifies no more than that which I have said, that it is represented, commemorated, and offered as slain.

" And therefore all parts agreeing to this, the Church of Rome requiring more is guilty of the Schism, that comes by refusing it. For the propitiation of the sacrifice of the Eucharist is the propitiation of Christ's Cross, purchased for them that are qualified.

" 10. The Council of Trent commends the Mass without the Communion, *cap.* 6, wherein it erreth,

" For the Communion being the restoring of the Covenant of baptism after sin, the want of it without the desire of it is to be lamented, not commended, as destructive of the means of salvation.

" 11. There is neither Scripture nor Tradition for praying to saints departed, or any evidence that they hear our prayers.

" Therefore it evidences a carnal hope that God will abate of the Covenant of our baptism, which is the condition of our salvation, for their sakes.

" 12. To pray to them for those things which only God can give (as all Papists do) is by the proper sense of their words *downright idolatry*.

" If they say their meaning is by a figure only to desire them to procure their requests of God; How dare any Christian trust his soul with that Church, which teaches that which must needs be idolatry in all that understand not the figure?

" 13. There is neither Scripture nor Tradition for worshipping the Cross, the Images, and Reliques of saints.

" Therefore it evidences the same carnal hope, that God will abate of his Gospel for such bribes. Which is the will-worship of Masses, Pilgrimages, and Indulgences to that purpose.

" 14. Neither Scripture nor Tradition is there for the removing any soul out of Purgatory unto the Beatifical Vision before the day of Judgment.

" Therefore the same carnal hope is seen in the will-worship of Masses, Indulgences, Pilgrimages, and the like, for that purpose: and that destructive to the salvation of all that believe that the guilt of their sins is taken away by submitting to the Keys before they be contrite; and the temporal penalty remaining in Purgatory paid by these will-worships.

" 15. Both Scripture and Tradition condemn the deposing of Princes, and acquitting their subjects of their allegiance, and enjoining them to take arms for them whom the Pope substitutes.

" And this doctrine is not only false, but in my opinion properly *heresy*, yet practised by so many Popes.

" The Church may be divided, that salvation may be had on both sides.

" Instances. The Schisms of the Popes. The Schism of Acacius. The Schism between the Greeks and the Latins.

" I hold the Schism for the Reformation to be of this kind.

" *But I do not allow salvation to any that shall change having these reasons before him:* though I allow the Reformation not to be perfect in some points of less moment, as *prayer for the dead*, and others.

" Remember always that the Popish Church of England can never be canonically governed being immediately under the Pope.

" 16. There is both Scripture and Tradition for the Scriptures and Service in a known tongue; and for the Eucharist in both kinds.

" How then can any Christian trust his soul with that Church, which hath the conscience to bar him of such helps provided by God ?"

Such was the judgment of Thorndike on Roman doctrine. I need hardly say that I do not give the document, as if I coincided with all the views expressed in it. But as far as our present subject is concerned, it is of considerable value.

There is one remark in it also, namely that which concerns " the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist," which, as Bishop Stillingfleet remarks, should be compared with a passage in another of his works, to ascertain his real meaning; where he says,—" If it can any way be showed, that the Church did ever pray that the Flesh and Blood might be substituted instead of the Elements under the accidents of them, then I am content that this be accounted henceforth the Sacramental presence of them in the Eucharist. But if the Church only pray that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the Elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Christ, *so that they which receive them may be filled with the grace of his Spirit*, then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the Elements in their bodily substance; because supposing that they

remain, they may nevertheless come to be *the instrument of God's Spirit to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it,* no otherwise than his flesh and blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth: *and that I suppose is reason enough to* CALL IT THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST SACRAMENTALLY, *that is to say, as in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.*" *

V. We now proceed, in the last place, to inquire what evidence is afforded by the testimony of individuals as to the relative character of the doctrine of the Church of England and that of the Church of Rome.

And first, what say the Romanists on this point?

Many Romish testimonies on the subject have been already noticed in the preceding pages, and therefore I will not here repeat them. But it would be easy to add to them to any extent.

"The doctrine of the Protestants," said Lord Mountague in a speech in the House of Lords in 1562, "doth repugn unto all the ecclesiastical state of England that were present at the last Parliament, and holdeth contradiction with all provinces of Christendom. It repugneth to all the doctrine of all the Parliaments past, and all general councils." †

So Sir Francis Englefield, who had been privy councillor to Queen Mary, and fled abroad on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, in a letter to the Privy Council in 1563, expostulating with them on the seizure of his goods, "prayed them to call to mind of what faith and conscience they had known him always to have been in religion, consonant to that he had been taught and bred up in, and *the present ôrders, proceedings, and laws in England so dissonant and varying therefrom.* Which two laid together did show how hard a choice was left to him, viz. either *in following the laws to wrest and strain his conscience,* or by not obeying them to offend his prince." ‡

* Laws of the Church, ch. iv. p. 30, as quoted by Bishop Stillingfleet in his "Several Conferences," &c., pp. 92, 3; who adds, that "in two or three places more he speaks to the same purpose."

† Strype's Ann. ch. 26. I. 1. 443.

‡ Ib. ch. 36. I. 2. 50.

The works of Thomas Harding in reply to Bishop Jewell's "Challenge" and "Apology" are so well known, the chief of them being reprinted in Bishop Jewell's works, that it is hardly necessary to do more than give a general reference to them.

The next witness shall be John Rastell, one of the principal Popish writers on the subject of Church of England matters. In his "Brief shew of the false wares packed together in the named Apology of the Church of England," (Louvain, 1567. sm. 8vo.) principally taken from Harding's Confutation of the Apology, he writes thus. The passage from the Apology, on which he comments, is this,—"We are come to that Church wherein they themselves cannot deny, (if they will say truly, and as they think in their own conscience,) but all things be governed purely and reverently, and as much as we possibly could very near to the order used in the old time." To which the reply is as follows,—"Here again our own conscience is brought forth against us, as though they did see by their spirit what we think inwardly, though we outwardly show *all signs to the contrary.* Many Catholics live out of their country, other many lie in prison within their country, some write whole books against the proceedings, and all (I think) do speak against them, when they may do it without danger of displeasure. *What should we do more, to declare that the new Gospel is damnable?*" (fol. 121.)

But in fact to what are all the volumes of Allen, Stapleton, Bridgewater, Bristow, and a host of others directed, but to the proof of the erroneousness, and inconsistency with the Catholic faith, of the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England?

And lastly, the doctrine established in our Church was solemnly condemned, *ex cathedra,* by Pope Pius V.; who in his Bull of Excommunication against Queen Elizabeth, issued in 1569, declares that "following and embracing *the errors of heretics,* she hath removed the Royal Council, consisting of the English nobility, and filled it with obscure men, being heretics, *suppressed the embracers of the Catholic faith,* placed dishonest preachers, and ministers of impieties; abolished the

sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, choice of meats, unmarried life, and the Catholic rites and ceremonies; COMMANDED BOOKS TO BE READ IN THE WHOLE REALM, CONTAINING MANIFEST HERESY AND IMPIOUS MYSTERIES . . . . presumed to throw bishops, parsons of churches, and other Catholic priests out of their churches and benefices, and to bestow them and other church livings upon *heretics;*" &c. &c.* What were those *heretical* books, but the Book of Common Prayer, the Book of Articles, and the Book of Homilies?

On the other hand, if we turn to the Church of England, we shall find the authorities of that Church testifying with one consent to the errors, superstition, and idolatry of the Church of Rome.

These testimonies, it will be found, are not the voices of a few individuals holding peculiar views, but testimonies which, taken together, show the mind of the English Church. And, as our space here for such evidence is limited, and the testimonies that might be brought, are innumerable, we will endeavour to classify them; so that without extending them to an irksome number, an impartial reader may clearly see that such is the case.

For this purpose, then, we will take the *series* of the successive occupants of the highest posts of authority in our Church; without regard to their peculiar views; beginning with the testimony of the first three Protestant Sovereigns of this country since the accession of Queen Elizabeth; which shall be followed by that of the Archbishops of Canterbury from the same period.

We begin with the statements of the first three sovereigns that reigned here after the establishment of the Reformation on the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

QUEEN ELIZABETH.

The testimony of Queen Elizabeth has been already given in a preceding page;† where, in her letter to the Popish

* Fuller's Church History, Cent. xvi. p. 94.

† See pp. 46, 7, above.

bishops, we find her charging Popery with "*inventions, heresies, and schisms* so numerous, that the flock of Christ have fed on poisonous shrubs for want of wholesome pastures;" and expressly accusing it of "*idolatry.*"

KING JAMES I.

"As for *prayer to saints,*" says King James, "Christ (I am sure) hath commanded us to come all to him that are loaden with sin, and he will relieve us; (Matt. xi. 28;) and St. Paul hath forbidden us to worship angels, or to use any such voluntary worship, that hath a shew of humility in that it spareth not the flesh. (Coloss. ii. 8, 23.) But what warrant we have to have recourse unto these *Dii Penates* or *Tutelares*, these Courtiers of God, I know not; I remit that to these philosophical neoteric divines. It satisfieth me to pray to God through Christ as I am commanded, which I am sure must be the safest way; and I am sure the safest way is the best way in points of salvation. But if the Romish Church hath coined new Articles of faith, never heard of in the first 500 years after Christ, I hope I shall never be condemned for an heretic, for not being a novelist. Such are the *private masses,* where the priest playeth the part both of the priest and of the people; and such are the *amputation of the one half of the sacrament* from the people; *the transubstantiation, elevation for adoration, and circumportation* in procession of the Sacrament; *the works of supererogation,* rightly named *thesaurus Ecclesiæ; the baptising of bells,* and a thousand other tricks; but above all, *the worshipping of Images.* If my faith be weak in these, I confess I had rather believe too little than too much: and yet since I believe as much as the Scriptures do warrant, the Creeds do persuade, and the ancient Councils decreed, I may well be a schismatic from Rome, but I am sure I am no heretic.

"For *reliques of saints,* if I had any such that I were assured were members of their bodies, I would honourably bury them, and not give them the reward of condemned men's members, which are only ordained to be deprived of burial.

But for worshipping either them or images, I must account it dammable idolatry.

"I am no *Iconomachus;* I quarrel not the making of images, either for public decoration, or for men's private uses: but that they should be worshipped, be prayed to, or any holiness attributed unto them, was never known of the ancients; and the Scriptures are so directly, vehemently, and punctually against it, as I wonder what brain of man, or suggestion of Satan durst offer it to Christians; and all must be salved with nice philosophical distinctions: as *Idolum nihil est*, and, *They* worship (forsooth) the images of things *in being*, and the image of the true God. But the Scripture forbiddeth to worship the image of anything that God created. It was not a *nihil* then that God forbad only to be worshipped, neither was the brazen serpent, nor the body of Moses a *nihil;* and yet the one was destroyed, and the other hidden for eschewing of idolatry. Yea, the image of God himself is not only expressly forbidden to be worshipped, but even to be made. . . Let them therefore that maintain this doctrine, *answer it to Christ at the latter day, when he shall accuse them of idolatry;* and then I doubt if he will be paid with such nice sophistical distinctions . . . . .

"As for *Purgatory*, and all the trash (Jubilees, Indulgencies, Satisfactions for the Dead, &c.) depending thereupon, it is not worth the talking of. Bellarmine cannot find any ground for it in all the Scriptures."

And proceeding to explain the prophecies relating to Antichrist, which he considers to be the Pope, he says, "By their fornication is meant both *their spiritual fornication of idolatry*, and &c. . . And they are guilty of theft, in stealing from God the titles and greatness of power due to him, and bestowing it upon their head, the *Antichrist:* as also by heaping up their treasure with their juggling wares and merchandise of the souls of men, by Jubilees, Pardons, Reliques, and such like strong delusions." *

* A Premonition to all Most Mighty Monarchs, &c. in his Works, ed. 1616. pp. 303-5 & 321.

In his "Declaration to his subjects of the causes which moved him to dissolve the Parliament," dated March 2, 1628-9, after expressing his firm resolve to "preserve that *unity of doctrine* and discipline established in the time of Queen Elizabeth," he adds subsequently,—"We do here profess to maintain *the true religion and doctrine* established in the Church of England, without admitting or conniving at any *backsliding* either *to Popery* or schism."*

And in his "Declaration to all those who profess the true, reformed, Protestant religion," in the year 1644, he observes, that, "many false rumours and scandalous letters" having been published, intimating "that we intend to give way to the introduction and public exercise of *Popery* again in our dominions," "we never entertained in our imagination the least thought to attempt such a thing, or to depart a jot from *that holy religion*, which when we received the crown and sceptre of this kingdom we took a most solemn and sacramental oath to profess and protect . . . . . This most holy *religion of the Anglican church*, ordained by so many Convocations of learned divines . . . . . we solemnly protest, that, by the help of Almighty God, we will endeavour, to our utmost power and last period of our life, to keep entire and inviolable, and will be careful, according to our duty to heaven, and the tenor of the foresaid most sacred oath at our coronation, that all our ecclesiastics in their several degrees and incumbences shall preach and practise the same."†

And in his conference with the Marquis of Worcester, as reported by his chaplain, Dr. T. Baylie,‡ (who had strong

* Works (ed. 1662, fol.) Pt. 2, pp. 19 & 29.

† Ib. pp. 411, 12.

‡ Certamen religiosum: or, a Conference between his late Majesty Charles King of England and Henry late Marquess and Earl of Worcester, concerning Religion; &c. &c. 1649. 12mo. It was republished, "together with a vindication of the Protestant cause from the pretences of the Marquess his last Papers, which the necessity of the King's affairs denied him opportunity to answer," by "Chr. Cartwright, Minister in the City of York." Lond. 1652. 4to. Doubts were entertained by some at that time of the genuineness of the account

Romish tendencies, and afterwards joined publicly the Romish Church, and therefore would not give any testimony against Rome more strength than was necessary,) we find the king speaking thus;—"I pray, my lord, satisfy me in these particulars: Why do you leave out the second commandment and cut another in two? Why do you withhold the cup from the laity? Why have you seven sacraments, when Christ instituted but two? Why do you abuse the world with such a fable as Purgatory, and make ignorant fools believe, you can fish souls from thence with silver hooks? Why do you pray to saints, and worship images? Those are the offences which are given by your Church of Rome unto the Church of Christ; of these things I would be satisfied."*

Again;—"Wherefore if you cry never so loud, *Sancta mater ecclesia, sancta mater ecclesia*, the holy mother church, holy mother church, as of old they had nothing to say for themselves but *Templum Domini, Templum Domini*, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, we will cry as loud again with the prophet: *Quomodo facta est meretrix urbs fidelis? how is the faithful city become a harlot?* if you vaunt never so much of your Roman Catholic Church, we can tell you out of St. John that she is become *the synagogue of Satan:* neither is it impossible, but that the house of prayers may be made a den of thieves: you call us heretics; we answer you with St. Paul, Acts xxiv. 14. *After the way which you call heresy, so worship we the God of our fathers, believing all things which were written in the Law and the Prophets.*" *

Let us take next the Archbishops of Canterbury. Now the series of these archbishops, from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the present time, stands thus,—Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Bancroft, Abbot, Laud, Juxon, Sheldon, Sancroft,

given of this Conference, from the favour evidently shown towards the cause of the Church of Rome. But this only gives additional weight to the testimony quoted above.

* Baylie's Certamen Religiosum, pp. 18, 9; or, Cartwright's edition, p. 16.

† Ib. pp. 111, 12; or, p. 43.

Tillotson, Tenison, Wake, Potter, Herring, Hutton, Secker, Cornwallis, Moore, and Sutton. And with the exception of those few among them from whom we can quote nothing, simply because they have left nothing, or next to nothing, in print, we have from all these prelates a distinct testimony against the errors and idolatry of the Church of Rome.

ARCHBISHOP PARKER.

In the Visitation Articles of this prelate already quoted,* we have sufficient testimony of his sense of the errors and idolatry of the Church of Rome.

But it is easy to add further evidence. Thus in the "Examination of Faithful Commin," a concealed Romanist, conducted by the archbishop before the queen, in 1567, the archbishop asks him, "But is this spirit that is in you, either the spirit of grace or truth, that doth not comply with the orders of the church, *lately purged and cleansed from schism and* IDOLATRY?" †

And in his Address to Convocation in 1571, he expressly identifies the Church of Rome with Antichrist, speaking of its errors in such terms as, among others, the following,—"This subject supplies me with abundant materials (if I wished to dwell longer upon it) to set before your eyes, by what arts Antichrist cunningly deceived us, and led us captive in clouds and darkness that might be felt into his dark dungeons. And this ought to be to us, above all things, a cause of infinite joy and peculiar thanksgiving to God, that that more than Cymmerian darkness has been dispersed, and the ineffable splendour of his truth has at length shone upon us. Moreover, we ought to gird ourselves and apply our whole strength and resources to the task both of resisting firmly the dark powers of the world and the devil, and defending and maintaining the truth of the divine

* See pp. 45, 48, and 79, above.

† Foxes and Firebrands, 2nd edit. Pt. 1, p. 19.

word so often assailed by our unprincipled and wicked adversaries." *

ARCHBISHOP GRINDAL.

From Archbishop Grindal, also, we have already quoted several passages,† occurring in his Visitation Articles, showing his sense of the opposition of the doctrine of the Church of England to that of the Church of Rome.

He also, like Archbishop Parker, distinctly charges the Church of Rome with the practice of idolatry.

Thus, in his Injunctions for the Province of York in 1571, he directs that various things used in the Popish services, as, holy-water-stocks, images, &c., " and all other relics and monuments of *superstition and idolatry* be utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed;" ‡ an order which is repeated in his Metropolitical Visitation Articles for the Province of Canterbury in 1576.§

And in his " Fruitful Dialogue between Custom and Verity," (written, says Strype, " soon after his coming back into England, for the better service of the Church, that was then to be purged of Popish doctrines and superstitions," ‖) he says,— " I remember that the Romish bishop was wont to have the Bible for his footstool, and so to tread down God's word evermore, when he stood at his mass. But, thanks be to God, he is now detected, and his abominations be opened and blown throughout all the world." ¶ And at the close of this treatise,

* " Hoc argumentum copiosam mihi materiam suppeditat (si in eo longior esse vellem) vobis ante oculos proponere, quibus nos antichristus præstigiis callide delusit, tenebrisque ac caligine palpabili in atros suos carceres duxit captivos. Quæ gaudii infiniti, et summas Deo gratias agendi, maxima nobis causa esse debet, quod profligatis illis plusquam cymmeriis tenebris, ineffabilis veritatis suæ splendor nobis tandem illuxit. Præterea accingere nos, totisque viribus ac apparatu insistere debemus, ut et caliginosis mundi ac diaboli potentiis fortiter resistamus, et divini verbi veritatem, ab improbis ac sceleratis nostris adversariis toties oppugnatam, tueamur atque teneamus."—Wilk. Concil. iv. 271.

† See p. 80, above.

‡ Inj. 7. See his Works, P. S. ed. p. 136.

§ Art. 6. Ib. p. 159.

‖ Strype's Life of Grindal, p. 464, (313 m.)

¶ Grindal's Works, p. 39.

speaking of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the consequent adoration of the elements, he says,—"Since which time [that is, the year 1050] even until this day, although *idolatry* had great increase, yet there never wanted some good men, which boldly would profess and set forth the truth; although they were well assured that their worldly reward should be spite, malice, imprisoning, sword, fire, and all kinds of torments." *

ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT.

"I do as much dislike that distinction of the Papists [i. e. that *they* worship *God* by their images, and the Jews and heathen worshipped *only their images*], and the intent of it, as any man doth, neither do I go about to excuse them from wicked, and (without repentance and God's singular mercy) *damnable idolatry:* but yet do I say, the idolatry both of the Jews and of the Gentiles (for the causes by me alleged) to be much greater. For there are three kinds of idolatry. One is, when the true God is worshipped by other means and ways, than he hath prescribed, or would be worshipped. The other is, when the true God is worshipped, together with false Gods. 2 *Regum.* 17. The third is, when we worship false Gods either in heart and mind, or in external creatures, living or dead, and altogether forget the worship of the true God. All these three kinds are detestable, but the first is the least, and the last is the worst: in the which kind the Israelites sundry times offended, as is manifest in the places before mentioned. The Papists worship God otherwise than his will is, and otherwise than he hath prescribed, *almost in all points of their worship*: they also give to the creature that which is due to the Creator, and sin against the first table: yet are they not, for ought that I can see, or learn, in the third kind of idolatry; and therefore *if they repent unfeignedly*, they are not to be cast either out of the Church, or out of the ministry. The Papists have little cause to thank me, or to fee me, for

* Ib. p. 74.

anything that I have spoken in their behalf as yet: *you see that I place them among wicked and damnable idolaters.* My defence is of those that have been Papists, and *be not,* and for no other." *

ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT.

In his famous sermon at Paul's Cross, Feb. 9, 1588, on 1 John iv. 1, this able champion of the rights and discipline of the Church, and opponent of the Puritans, thus speaks of the Romanists:—

"The Popish false prophets will suffer the people to try nothing, but to [? do] teach them wholly to depend upon them, and to that purpose they have indeed three notable slights.

"First they forbid them the reading of the Scriptures; and the better to be obeyed therein, they will not permit the Scriptures to be translated into their vulgar tongue; whereof it came to pass that the people were so easily seduced and drawn from Christ to the Pope; from his merits to the saints and their own merits; from his bloody sacrifice, whereby only sins are remitted, to their most dry and fruitless sacrifice; from the spiritual food of his Body and Blood, unto a carnal and Capernaitical Transubstantiation; from the calling upon his name, to the Invocation of saints; and from their sure trust and confidence in his death, to a vain imagination of the virtue of their Masses, Pilgrimages, and Pardons, and I know not to what *intolerable superstition and idolatry.*

"Against this their falsehood, and very lewd dealing, all those places of Scripture may be alleged, wherein we are commanded to search the Scriptures, 'to prove all things, and to hold that which is good;' and likewise in this place, to try and 'examine the spirits, whether they be of God.'

. . . . . .

"The second shift which these false prophets of the Romish Church do use, is this; Now that they perceived the Scriptures to be translated into the language almost of every nation, and

* Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, (1574, fol.) Tract 3, p. 152.

that the Books are now so common in every man's hands, as that with their former device they are no longer able to cover their nakedness; they labour with all their might to bind us to the Fathers, to the Councils, and to the Church of Rome, protesting very deeply, that we must admit of no other sense of any place of the Scriptures, than the Romish Church shall be pleased to deliver unto us. . . .

"To repel the grossness of this absurd opinion, all that is very effectual, which is brought to prove that the Church is inferior to the Scriptures. Besides, we say, that the Fathers do in many points dissent amongst themselves; and their general Councils have been oftentimes repugnant one to another. But yet we join with them upon a nearer issue. Where the Fathers do all agree together, we do not *dislike them*, and for the first four general Councils, we *allow and approve them;* and hereof it cometh to pass, that we do the rather condemn many points of Popery, in that they have of latter days broached and taught us sundry very strange and dangerous opinions; which as they are not to be found in the Scriptures, so are they repugnant as well to the Fathers, as to all the aforesaid general Councils.

"Whereupon ariseth their third shift.

"They will not stick to confess, that they teach many things now, which are not to be proved either by the words of Scripture, Fathers, or Councils. Marry, say they, if the Apostles and Fathers had lived in our times, they would have taught and decreed as we have done.

. . . . . .

"To repel these blasphemous assertions, all those authorities of Scripture are very material, wherein God is shewed to be immutable, and his word an everlasting word, and a word of truth. Likewise those sentences of the Fathers, wherein they appeal, as occasion serveth, to the Scriptures, accounting them as *the very Touchstone and Rule of all truth.* Which could not be true, if (as the Papists say) they were like a nose of wax, or a sword of lead, that might be turned as a man lists; or like to the Cameleon, that changeth his colours according

to his seat; or as though the Scriptures were to yield to the fantasies of men; that as they changed their minds, being by nature mutable, so the Scriptures should change the sense and meaning of God, who is not subject to any alteration or change. It were but a deceitful Touchstone that would apply itself unto the goldsmith's pleasure; and he that should trust it, were not unlike oft-times for pure gold to be deceived with copper. The Lord open their eyes, that they may see the grossness of this their great sin: or otherwise I can say nothing farther of them, but that if needs they will be filthy, let them be filthy still." *

And in his "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings," first published in 1593, he speaks of those who for the profession of the "right religion," "are mightily afflicted by certain giants of the earth, the soldiers and members of *that Antichrist of Rome*."†

ARCHBISHOP ABBOT.

When King James I. consulted Archbishop Abbot in 1623, on the subject of a toleration of the Popish religion, proposed by the Court of Spain as a condition of the marriage of Prince Charles with the Infanta, the Archbishop in his reply warns him against setting up "the most damnable and heretical doctrine of the Church of Rome," and reminds him,—"How hateful it will be to God, and grievous to your good subjects, the professors of the Gospel, that your Majesty, who hath often disputed, and learnedly written, against those heresies, should now shew yourself a patron of those wicked doctrines, which your pen hath told the world, and your conscience tells yourself, are *superstitious, idolatrous, and detestable*." ‡

* See Bibliotheca Scriptorum Eccles. Anglic. Lond. 1709, 8vo. (generally but not correctly said to be edited by Dr. G. Hickes,) pp. 268—71.

† Dangerous Positions and Proceedings, p. 2.

‡ Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. p. 85. Life of Abbot, (Guildf. 1777, 8vo.) p. 35.

"The Church of Rome," says Archbishop Laud in his answer to Fisher, "hath solemnly decreed her errors; and erring, hath yet decreed withal that she cannot err. . . . . And therefore in this present case there is peril, *great peril of damnable both schism and heresy, and other sin, by living and dying in the Roman faith, tainted with so many superstitions as at this day it is*, and their tyranny to boot. . . . . I do, indeed, for my part, (leaving other men free to their own judgment,) acknowledge a *possibility* of salvation in the Roman Church; but so, as that which I grant to Romanists, is not as they are Romanists, but as they are Christians; that is, as they believe the Creed, and hold the foundation, Christ himself, not as they associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to *the gross superstitions* of the Romish Church." *

"ALL PROTESTANTS UNANIMOUSLY AGREE IN THIS, 'THAT THERE IS GREAT PERIL OF DAMNATION FOR ANY MAN TO LIVE AND DIE IN THE ROMAN PERSUASION;' AND YOU ARE NOT ABLE TO PRODUCE ANY ONE PROTESTANT THAT EVER SAID THE CONTRARY. And therefore that is a most *notorious slander*, where you say, that they which affirm this peril of damnation are contradicted by their own more learned brethren." †

"A Church may hold the fundamental point literally, and, as long as it stays there, be without control; and yet ERR GROSSLY, DANGEROUSLY, NAY DAMNABLY, IN THE EXPOSITION OF IT. AND THIS IS THE CHURCH OF ROME'S CASE. For most true it is, it hath in all ages maintained the faith unchanged in the expression of the Articles themselves; but it hath, in the exposition both of Creeds and Councils, quite changed and lost the sense and the meaning of some of them. So the faith is in many things changed, both for life and belief, and yet seems the same." ‡

* Relation of the Conference between Laud and Fisher, with an answer to the exceptions of A. C. (first published, Lond. 1639, fol.) § 35. Oxf. ed. 1839, 8vo. pp. 250, 251.

† Ib. § 35, p. 254.

‡ Ib. § 37, p. 269.

And Bishop Stillingfleet, in the Preface to his "Discourse concerning the idolatry practised in the Church of Rome," tells us, that in the Archbishop's marginal notes upon Bellarmine, written with his own hand, and then in Bishop Stillingfleet's possession, "where Bellarmine (De Sanct. beat. l. i. c. 20.) answers the testimony of the Council of Laodicea against the worship of angels, by saying, 'That it doth not condemn all worship of angels, but only that which is proper to God;' he [the archbishop] replies, 'That Theodoret, who produced that testimony of the Council, expressly mentions the praying to angels; therefore,' saith he, 'the praying to them was that *idolatry* which the Council condemns.'" *

The next occupant of the See of Canterbury was WILLIAM JUXON, who has left nothing but a sermon on the death of King Charles, and Considerations on the Act for Uniformity. He was succeeded by GILBERT SHELDON, of whom, (except some Letters and Orders given by Wilkins,) one sermon only remains, namely a thanksgiving sermon on the Restoration. These small pieces have not fallen into my hands, but are hardly likely to contain anything on our present subject.

ARCHBISHOP SANCROFT.

In his "Articles recommended to all the bishops within his Metropolitan Jurisdiction," in 1688, the eleventh Article is as follows,—"That they [i. e. the clergy] also walk in wisdom towards those who are not of our communion . . . . that they take all opportunities of assuring and convincing them, *that the bishops of this church are really and sincerely irreconcileable enemies to the errors, superstitions,* IDOLATRIES, *and tyrannies of the Church of Rome, and that the very unkind jealousies, which some have had of us to the contrary, were altogether groundless.* And in the last place, that they warmly and most affectionately exhort them to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of peace, for an universal blessed union *of all reformed*

* Bishop Stillingfleet's Discourse concerning the idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, and the hazard of salvation in the communion of it; Preface. Third ed. 1672. pag. penult.

churches, both at home and abroad, against our *common enemies;* and that all they, who do confess the holy name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the truth of his holy word, may also meet in one holy communion, and live in perfect unity and godly love."*

The same language he uses in his sermon preached before the House of Lords in 1678, on the discovery of the Popish Plot; where, speaking of the contrivances of the Papists to throw things into confusion, that they might "rear up a new world of their own," he adds, "But what a world! a world made up of a new heaven of *superstitions* and *idolatries,*"† &c.

Such is the language even of the leader of the Nonjurors.

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON.

In his sermon entitled, "The hazard of being saved in the Church of Rome," this prelate remarks,—

"I. First, We will consider some doctrines and practices which the church of Rome hath built upon the foundation of Christianity, to the great hazard and danger of men's salvation. It is not denied by the most judicious Protestants, but that the Church of Rome do hold all the Articles of the Christian faith which are necessary to salvation. But that which we charge upon them, as a just ground of our separation from them, is the imposing of new doctrines and practices upon Christians as necessary to salvation, which were never taught by our Saviour, or his apostles; and which are either *directly contrary to the doctrine of Christianity, or too apparently destructive of a good life.* And I begin,

"1. With their doctrines. And because I have no mind to aggravate lesser matters, I will single out four or five points of doctrine . . . . . And the first which I shall mention, and which being once admitted, makes way for as many errors as they please to bring in, is their doctrine of infallibility . . .

. . . . . .

* Wilk. Concil. iv. 619.

† Sancroft's Sermons. 1703. 8vo. pp. 133, 4.

2. Their doctrine about repentance, which consists in confessing their sins to the priest; which if it be but accompanied with any degree of contrition, does upon absolution received from the priest put them into a state of salvation, though they have lived the most lewd and debauched lives that can be imagined; than which nothing can be more plainly destructive of a good life. . . . .

" 3. The doctrine of Purgatory; by which they mean an estate of temporary punishments after this life, from which men may be released and translated into heaven by the prayers of the living and the sacrifice of the Mass. That this doctrine was not known in the primitive church, nor can be proved from Scripture, we have the free acknowledgment of as learned and eminent men as any of that Church; which is to acknowledge that it is a superstructure upon the Christian religion . . . . . .

" 4. The doctrine of Transubstantiation. A hard *word*, but I would to God that were the worst of it; the *thing* is much more difficult. I have taken some pains to consider other religions that have been in the world, and I must freely declare, that I never yet in any of them met with any article or proposition, imposed upon the belief of men, half so unreasonable and hard to be believed as this is: and yet this in the Romish Church is esteemed one of the most principal articles of the Christian faith; though there is no more certain foundation for it in Scripture, than for our Saviour's being substantially changed into all those things which are said of him, as that he is a *rock*, a *vine*, a *door*, and a hundred other things. But this is not all. This doctrine hath not only no certain foundation in Scripture, but I have a far heavier charge against it, namely, that it *undermines the very foundation of Christianity itself*. . . . .

. . . . . .

" 5. I will instance but in one doctrine more: and that shall be, their doctrine of deposing kings in case of heresy, and absolving their subjects from their allegiance to them. . . . . .

" II. I come now, in the second place, to consider some

practices of the Church of Rome, which I am afraid will prove as bad as her *doctrines*. I shall instance in these five.

" 1. Their celebrating of their divine service in an unknown tongue. And that not only contrary to the practice of the primitive Church, and to the great end and design of religious worship, which is the edification of those who are concerned in it, (and it is hard to imagine how men can be edified by what they do not understand,) but likewise in direct contradiction to St. Paul, who hath no less than a whole chapter wherein he confutes this practice as fully, and condemns it as plainly, as any thing is condemned in the whole Bible. And they that can have the face to maintain that this practice was not condemned by St. Paul, or that it was allowed and used in the first ages of Christianity, need not be ashamed to set up for the defence of any paradox in the world.

" 2. The communion in one kind. And that notwithstanding that even by their own acknowledgment our Saviour instituted it in both kinds, and the primitive Church administered it in both kinds. This I must acknowledge is no addition to Christianity, but a *sacrilegious taking away of an essential part of the sacrament*. For the cup is as essential a part of the Institution as the bread; and they might as well, and by the same authority, take away the one as the other, and both as well as either.

" 3. Their worshipping of images. Which practice (notwithstanding all their distinctions about it, which are no other but what the Heathens used in the same case,) is *as point-blank against the second Commandment, as a deliberate and malicious killing of a man is against the sixth*. But if the case be so plain, a man would think that at least the teachers and guides of that Church should be sensible of it. Why, they are so, and afraid the people should be so too, and therefore, in their ordinary Catechisms and Manuals of devotion they leave out the second Commandment, and divide the tenth into two to make up the number; lest if the common people should know it, their consciences should start at the doing of a thing *so directly contrary to the plain command of God*.

"4. The worshipping of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, out of a false and groundless persuasion, that they are substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ. Which if it be not true, (and it hath good fortune if it be, for certainly it is one of the most incredible things in the whole world,) then *by the confession of several of their own learned writers, they are guilty of gross idolatry.*

"5. The worship and invocation of saints and angels; and particularly of the Virgin Mary, which hath now for some ages been a principal part of their religion. Now a man may justly wonder, that so considerable a part of religion as they make this to be, should have no manner of foundation in the Scripture. Does our Saviour anywhere speak one word concerning the worshipping of her? Nay, does he not take all occasions to restrain all extravagant apprehensions and imaginations concerning honour due to her, as foreseeing the degeneracy of the Church in this thing? When he was told that his mother and brethren were without: 'Who (says he) are my mother and my brethren? He that doth the will of my Father, the same is my mother, my sister and brother.' And when the woman brake forth into that rapture concerning the blessed mother of our Lord, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps that gave thee suck,' our Saviour diverts to another thing, 'Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.' . . . . Can any man believe, that if this had been the practice of the Church from the beginning, our Saviour and his apostles would have been so silent about so considerable a part of religion; insomuch that in all the epistles of the apostles, I do not remember that her name is so much as once mentioned? . . . . .

"And thus I have given you some instances of several *doctrines* and *practices* which the Church of Rome hath built upon the foundation of Christianity. Much more might have been said of them, but from what hath been said, any man may easily discern how dangerous they are to the salvation of men." *

* Tillotson's Works, vol. i. Lond. 1735. fol. pp. 94—8.

And in his sermon entitled, " The Protestant religion vindicated from the charge of singularity and novelty," preached before K. Charles II., and published at his command, he speaks thus :—

" But do we, then, charge the Church of Rome with *idolatry ? Our Church most certainly does so, and hath always done it from the beginning of the Reformation, in her homilies and liturgy and canons, and in the writings of her best and ablest champions. And though I have, as impartially as I could, considered what hath been said on both sides in this controversy ; yet I must confess, I could never yet see any tolerable defence made by them against this heavy charge.* And they themselves acknowledge themselves to be greatly under the suspicion of it, by saying, (as Cardinal Perron and others do,) that the primitive Christians for some ages did neither worship images, nor pray to saints, for fear of being thought to approach too near the heathen idolatry. And, which is yet more, divers of their most learned men do confess, that if Transubstantiation be not true, they are as gross idolaters as any in the world. And I hope they do not expect it from us, that in compliment to them, and to acquit them from the charge of idolatry, we should presently deny our senses, and believe Transubstantiation ; and if we do not believe this, they grant we have reason to charge them with idolatry.

" But we own them to be a true church ; which they cannot be, if they be guilty of idolatry. This they often urge us withal, and there seems at first sight to be something in it : and for that reason I shall endeavour to give so clear and satisfactory an answer to it, as that we may never more be troubled with it.

" The truth is, we would fain hope, because they still retain the essentials of Christianity, and profess to believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith, that notwithstanding their corruptions they may still retain the true essence of a Church : as a man may be truly and really a man, though he have the plague upon him ; and for that reason be fit to be avoided by all that wish well to themselves. But if this will not do, we

cannot help it. Therefore to push the matter home; Are they sure that this is a firm and good consequence, That if they be idolaters, they cannot be a true Church? Then let them look to it. It is they, I take it, that are concerned to prove themselves a true Church, and not we to prove it for them. And if they will not understand it of themselves, it is fit they should be told that there is a great difference between concessions of charity and of necessity, and that a very different use ought to be made of them. We are willing to think the best of them; but if they dislike our charity in this point, nothing against the hair: if they will forgive us this injury, we will not offend them any more: but rather than have any further difference with them about this matter, we will for quietness sake compound it thus; That till they can clearly acquit themselves from being idolaters, they shall never more against their wills be esteemed a true Church." *

ARCHBISHOP TENISON.

"For the Church of England, ... in her 22nd Article concerning Purgatory, she saith of that and of the Romish doctrine touching pardons, worship, and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also of invocation of saints, 'That it is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.' Now what can we judge of that worship which hath for its object something else besides God, and is contrary to the Scripture? We cannot but think it, not a mere impertinence, but *a wicked act;* an act which by contradicting his authority diminisheth his honour; and being an act of worship, nothing less than *one degree of idolatry.* Again in its 28th Article, it teacheth concerning the consecrated elements, 'That they were not by Christ's institution or ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up and worshipped.' By which words it noteth the adoration of the Host in the Church of Rome, not as an

* Tillotson's Works, vol. i. Lond. 1735. fol. pp. 252, 3.

innocent circumstance added by the discretion of the church, but as *an unlawful worship;* though it doth not expressly brand it with the name of idolatry. In the rubric after the communion, the adoration of the consecrated elements is upon this reason forbidden, 'because the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances.' And it is there added, 'That they so remaining, the adoration of them would be idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians.' This rubric doth in effect charge the Church of Rome with *gross idolatry;* for it supposeth the object which they materially worship to be in its natural substance still a creature, and a creature disjoined from personal union with Christ, and not (according to the words of their St. Thomas, (*in orat. post missam,*) inserted into their missal,) a Deity latent under the accidents of bread and wine. And it concludeth, that the worship of such a substance is such idolatry as Christian religion abhorreth. It doth not indeed affirm in terms, that the worship of such a substance by a Romanist who verily thinks it to be not bread, but a Divine body, is idolatry; *but it saith that whence such a conclusion may be inferred.* It saith that the bread is still bread in its substance, and if it be really such whilst it is worshipped, the mistake of the worshipper cannot alter the nature of the thing, though according to the degrees of unavoidableness in the causes of his ignorance, it may extenuate the crime."

"The Homilies which are an appendage to our Church do expressly arraign the Roman Catholics as idolaters in the learned discourses of the peril of idolatry."

And having then proceeded, at some length, to consider the nature of the worship paid by the Romanists in their invocation of the saints, he concludes,—"Now though by this discourse, I may have given offence unto the *Marians;* or rather said that which will be made an offence by their misconstruction; I am not jealous that I have at all offended those blessed spirits, if they have knowledge of that which I write. For they are not covetous of undue honour; but cast those crowns with high indignation under their feet, which are set on their

heads to the dishonour of God, by the *idolatrous flatteries* of foolish men." *

ARCHBISHOP WAKE.

"I am verily persuaded," says Archbishop Wake, in the Preface to his "Discourse concerning the nature of Idolatry," "that the Romanists, in the Invocation of saints, and in the worship of images and reliques, and of the Host, are *guilty of idolatry*." †

And in the Treatise itself we find the following passages.

"I am now come to the last point to be considered, and it is indeed so necessarily consequent upon the foregoing, that if what I have before said concerning the notion of idolatry under the Old Testament be allowed, this cannot be denied: viz. That as the Jews retaining both the apprehension and worship of the truly supreme God, were nevertheless guilty of idolatry, for worshipping him after a Gentile manner, so may Christians be now, and therefore that *the Church of Rome may justly be charged by us as idolatrous*, though we do not pretend in any wise to say either that she worships the sun, moon, and stars, or any other visible and corporeal Deity, as the supreme God, or that she has lost all apprehension of a spiritual and invisible Godhead." ‡

"And now from what has been said, I will venture to conclude in behalf of our Church, and of those learned men of our communion, who have been concerned in this controversy, that the notion of idolatry which both *the one teaches*, and the others have defended, is, after all this author's clamours against it, neither new nor unlearned, nor fanatical, nor anticatholic, nor antichristian, nor any of those ill things he pretends; but the truly ancient, learned, and catholic notion of it: the notion which God in his holy word has established; which the Jews received; the apostles taught, and the Christian Church till

* Tenison, Of Idolatry, 1678. 4to. pp. 179—81, 182, 263.

† Discourse concerning the nature of idolatry. Lond. 1688. 4to. Preface, p. vi.

‡ Ib. p. 83.

these latter days, that men's interest prompted them to seek out to themselves new inventions, constantly maintained. It was by this notion that St. Paul censured the worship of the Golden Calf as idolatrous, and condemned the Gentile world of the same crime. Rom. i. 21, 23. This was the notion that made our forerunners in the Faith, choose rather to suffer martyrdom than to give religious worship to any creature whatsoever. And whatever this author thinks of those primitive saints, I am confident he will find but very few besides, that will believe they sacrificed their lives to their folly and passion, and died only to defend a mistaken notion of idolatry. It was this notion upon which the ancient Fathers condemned the Arians of idolatry. They did not believe Christ to be either the sun or moon, or any other visible or corporeal Deity, or the Image of the supreme and invisible Godhead. They believed him to be the most divine and excellent Being after God, only they denied that he was coeternal and coequal with the Father; and yet those holy orthodox Fathers censured them as idolaters, because supposing him to be a creature they worshipped him as a God. And upon the very same notion it is, that *the Reformed Churches have ever looked upon the worship of images and saints in the Church of Rome, as deserving the very same censure.* And I cannot but wonder, that this author should charge the invention of this notion upon a person now living, which he must needs have known *both our Church and the writers of it have constantly asserted, before any of this generation ever saw the light.*" *

ARCHBISHOP POTTER.

"This practice [i. e. of setting forth the true sense of the Scriptures] hath been abused to very ill ends by the Church of Rome; which, instead of explaining the true sense of Scripture, hath *invented and imposed new articles of faith, contrary both to Scripture and reason.*" †

So he tells us in the passage above ‡ quoted, that "be-

* Ib. pp. 88—90.

† Defence of Charge delivered in 1719. Works, vol. i. p. 356.

‡ See p. 92, above.

side other *errors and heresies*, those of the Church of Rome are expressly condemned" in the Articles. *

And so, further on in the same Charge, he classes the Papists with " other sectaries and *heretics*." †

As we proceed, the testimonies on this subject become of course more incidental, the overthrow of the power and hopes of the Papists at the Revolution having gradually produced a state of comparative peace and safety to the Church as it respected her Romish adversaries. In the writings of the succeeding archbishops, therefore, we could scarcely expect similar testimonies to those we have quoted from their predecessors; simply because their attention was not drawn in the same way to the subject. Nor indeed, with one exception, Thomas Secker, have we anything remaining of the subsequent metropolitans, except, at most, two or three sermons, where we do not, in general, look for polemical theology. Such was the case with THOMAS HERRING and MATTHEW HUTTON, the immediate successors of Potter. To Matthew Hutton, however, succeeded

THOMAS SECKER.

In whose writings, though the subject is but incidentally mentioned, as one not brought before him by any controversy then present, the same testimony is borne as that of his predecessors to the errors and *idolatry* of the Church of Rome.

Thus. in his Charge to his Clergy, when Bishop of Oxford, in 1738, he says, " But besides those controversies to which this caution chiefly relates, *that between the Papists and us* deserves at present to be well studied, by such of you as live in the neighbourhood of any. For seldom have they shown more zeal or more artifice, than of late, in their attempts of making proselytes. And therefore it is of great consequence, that we provide ourselves against them, with a sufficient knowledge of their real doctrines, their most specious pleas, and the proper answers to them." ‡ Again, in his second Charge to the Dio-

* Charge. Ib. p. 293. † Ib. p. 297.

‡ Eight Charges, &c. Lond. 1769. 8vo. p. 19.

cese of Canterbury, in 1762, he says, "I have not now in my view either the Church of Rome, or the Protestants who broke off from us a century ago. The methods of dealing with both have been long since prescribed, and I repeat them not; but *entreat your attention to the movements* of each, *especially the former*, if you have any of them in your parishes." * And in the Address which he had prepared for the Convocation in 1761, he speaks of the Papists (Pontificii) as those, "qui occultis licet nunc dierum odiis, immortalibus tamen, diligenter sibi vires in idoneum tempus comparant;" † and thus regrets that their "poisonous volumes" were not at that time better met by replies to them,—"*Olim* contra Infideles, Pontificios, oppugnatores quoscunque, summa cum gloria militavimus: quorum *renenatis voluminibus*, domi forisque affatim editis, nunc parum aut nihil reponimus: unde illis famæ celebritas, et discipulorum multitudo; *nobis opprobrium.*" ‡

And in his "Lectures on the Church Catechism," after explaining the true doctrine of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, he remarks,—"This real presence of Christ in the sacrament, his Church hath always believed. But the monstrous notion of his *bodily* presence was started 700 years after his death: and arose chiefly from the indiscretion of preachers and writers of warm imaginations . . . . . And when once an opinion had taken root, that seemed to exalt the holy sacrament so much, it easily grew and spread: and the more for its *wonderful absurdity*, in those ignorant and superstitious ages: till at length, 500 years ago, and 1200 years after our Saviour's birth, it was established for a Gospel-truth by the pretended authority of the Romish Church. And even this had been tolerable in comparison, if they had not added *idolatrous practice to erroneous belief:* worshipping on their knees a bit of bread for the Son of God. Nor are they content to do this themselves, but, with most unchristian cruelty, curse and murder those who refuse it." §

* Ib. p. 279. † Ib. p. 354. ‡ Ib. p. 367.
§ Lect. on the Catechism, 3rd ed. Lond. 1771. pp. 305, 6.

To Thomas Secker succeeded FREDERICK CORNWALLIS, who has left only two or three sermons on special occasions; JOHN MOORE, of whom I find no remains; and CHARLES MANNERS SUTTON, who also has left only two or three sermons preached on particular occasions. This completes the succession in the Metropolitan See to its present venerable and respected occupant.

This is a chain of testimony on the force of which it would be a waste of words to offer any remark.

THE IRISH CHURCH.

For the Irish Church we may refer to a document issued by a synod of Irish bishops in 1626, and signed by Usher, archbishop of Armagh, and eleven of the Irish bishops, in which it is said, "*The religion of the Papists is superstitious and idolatrous: their faith and doctrine erroneous and heretical: their Church, in respect of both, apostatical.*" *

"We charge the adherents of the Church of Rome with *gross idolatry*," says Archbishop Usher, in his Sermon before the Commons in the year 1620, (p. 30,) "because that, contrary to God's express commandment, they are found to be worshippers of images. Neither will it avail them here to say, that the idolatry forbidden in the Scripture is that only which was used by the Jews and Pagans. For as well might one plead, that Jewish or heathenish fornication was here only reprehended, as Jewish or heathenish idolatry. But as the one is a foul sin, whether it be committed by Jew, Pagan, or Christian; so, if such as profess the name of Christ shall practise that which the word of God condemneth in Jews or Pagans for idolatry, their profession is so far from diminishing, that it augmenteth rather, the heinousness of the crime." †

After such evidence it seems almost superfluous to add any more; but it may not be without its use briefly to notice the

* Foxes and Firebrands. (2nd ed. Dubl. 1682.) Pt. 2. p. 67.

† See Preface to Stillingfleet's Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome.

testimony of some of the divines of our Church, whose witness, on this subject, may be considered, from one cause or another, as having peculiar weight.

We will first give that of the celebrated opponent of the Nonconformists,

BISHOP BRIDGES.

"The controversies between the common adversaries and us, are *pro aris et focis*, for matters, and that capital matters, of the substance and life of our Christian religion; not trifles, as some neutrals would bear the people in hand. And therefore our adversaries in matters of religion are incensed against us with mortal or rather with immortal hatred. Whereas the controversies betwixt us and our brethren, [that is, the Nonconformists or Puritans] are matters, or rather (as they call them) but manners and forms of the Church's regiment." *

"The Papists, from whose gross errors in doctrine we both dissent, and against whom, in the unity and substance of God's truth we both agree, (and for a while conjointly we impugned their *errors*, *idolatries*, and *superstitions*,) at the first in defence of them they began to write freshly and stoutly against us," &c. †

BISHOP BILSON,

Who calls the Romish faith and that of the Church of England "two religions," "the first authorized by Christ, and bequeathed in his testament to the Church: *the next invented by Antichrist and flatly repugnant to the Prophetical and Apostolical Scriptures.*" ‡ He says that the worshipping of images, even those of Christ himself, is "*heathenism and idolatry;*" § "unless you can prove," he says, "that Christ will be served with material and artificial images, and is content to accept that honour as done to himself, which is yielded unto

* Def. of Eccl. Gov. (A. 1587.) Pref. p. 3. † Ib. p. 4.

‡ The true difference between Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion. Lond. 1586. 8vo. Pt. i. p. 30.

§ Ib. Pt. iv. p. 321.

them, your adoring them maketh them idols and yourselves *idolaters*. For they be things made with hands, which you cannot worship without apparent idolatry." And to the objection, "we worship not them, but him that is represented by them," he replies, "It lieth not in your power to divide adoration betwixt Christ and his image, or with your intention to assign that honour unto him, which you do to the works of your own hands without his warrant." * And of their adoration of the elements, he says, "You first imagine the creatures to be Christ, and then you give them divine honour, as if they were Christ: but if they be creatures still, how doth your false imagination excuse you from *idolatry?*" † "The chiefest points of your religion," he tells them, "be mere novelties and barbarous absurdities." ‡

BISHOP LANCELOT ANDREWS

In plain terms charges the Church of Rome with *idolatry*, and says that Bellarmine runs into heresy, nay into madness, to defend it.§ And in his Answer to Cardinal Perron, condemning the Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints, he ridicules the Cardinal's distinctions of invocation direct and indirect, absolute and relative, sovereign and subaltern, which he says, "be three new devices of the Cardinal and yet help him not. For though the invocation of them be not a direct, absosolute, and sovereign invocation, yet if it be an indirect, relative, or subaltern invocation, an invocation it is . . . and so what shall become of St. Augustine's *non invocantur?*" ‖ And in reply to some passages adduced by the Cardinal from the Fathers on this subject, he says,—"Neither was it ever the Fathers' mind, by using those flowers of oratory, to teach the people *idolatry*. For who is there that when he heareth an apostrophe, to a thing without sense, or to a party dead, but

* Ib. pp. 345, 6. † Ib p. 530. ‡ Ib. p. 384.

§ Ad Torti librum respons. p. 312. I give this reference on the authority of Bp. Stillingfleet, Disc. of Idolatry &c. Preface.

‖ Answer to the xxth chapter of the 5th Book of Cardinal Perron's Reply, p. 37. In his "Opuscula quædam posthuma."

knoweth it is a figure of Rhetoric, and not any serious invocation ?" * And he shows afterwards, that even if there were any force in the distinctions drawn by the Cardinal, they would not be of any use to the Church of Rome, for, he says, " it is most evident, by their Breviaries, Hours, and Rosaries, that they pray directly, absolutely, and finally to saints, and make no mention at all of *prier pour prier*, to pray to God forgive [to give] them, but to the saints, to give it themselves." † And he proceeds to quote various addresses to the Virgin Mary and the saints in proof of this.

DEAN FIELD

Expressly maintains that " the Church of Rome" " is *heretical ;*" ‡ and her invocation of saints,§ and adoration of the elements,‖ *idolatrous*.

DR. THOMAS JACKSON.

" There is so much of the true Church in the present Romish visible Church, as a man cannot say, it is no Church at all ; so much true doctrine in it as sufficeth to support the title of *Antichrist*, and to make it the very seat of all abominations or impieties more than natural. For, as the mingling of the traditions of men with Moses' doctrine did make the leaven of Pharisees to be so malignant and distasteful to God and all good men, so is it the mixture or making up of the doctrine of Christ and of devils, in one and the same Liturgy, which makes Antichristianism in grain. And as elsewhere is observed, (Bk. iii. on Creed, sect. iii. and iv. in divers chapters) *the idolatry of the Romish Church* is so much worse than the idolatry of the heathens, by how much that Church's general belief of one God, of the glorious Trinity, and of the redemption of mankind, is better than the heathens' belief or knowledge of the same points."¶ And speaking in the same

* Ib. p. 47. † Ib. p. 58.

‡ Of the Church, Bk. 3, ch. 47, p. 175, ed. 1628.

§ Ib. ch. 20, p. 114. ‖ Ib. ch. 34, p. 150.

¶ A Treatise of the Holy Catholic Faith and Church. Bk. 1. St. 3, ch. 18, § 5.

Treatise concerning the invocation of saints and veneration of images, and alluding to the second Nicene Council, he says, "By what spirit this Council was managed, or in whose name they met together, I refer the reader unto that learned treatise in the Book of Homilies (*whereunto we have all subscribed*) concerning the *peril of idolatry*, especially the third part." * "Of *the equivalency of idolatry in Rome heathen, and Rome Christian*, elsewhere at large;" referring to his "Fifth book upon the Creed, or a treatise containing the original of unbelief, &c. Sect. iv." † where the reader will find that subject fully handled.

DR. PETER HEYLIN,

In his fourth sermon on the Tares, preached at White-Hall, Jan. 27, 1638, (p. 110,) has these words;—"So it is also in the point of images, first introduced into the Church for ornament, history and imitation . . . . But when the Schools began to state it, that the same veneration was to be afforded to the type and prototype, then came the doctrine to the growth. When and by whom and where it was first so stated, is not easy to determine, and indeed not necessary. It is enough that we behold it in the fruits. And what fruits think you could it bear, but *most gross idolatry, greater than which was never known among the Gentiles?* . . . . . And for the images of the saints, they that observe with what laborious pilgrimages, magnificent processions, solemn offerings, and in a word, with what affections, prayers, and humble bendings of the body, they have been and are worshipped in the Church of Rome, might very easily conceive that she was once again *relapsed into her antient Paganism.*" With much more (adds Bishop Stillingfleet, from whom I give the quotation) to the same purpose.‡

* Ib. ch. 22, § 1. † Ib. ch. 22. §. 2.

‡ See Stillingfleet's Answer to several Treatises, &c. Preface, d 3 and d 4.

" The worshipping of these [i. e. the souls of the saints departed] (as among the Papists it is most ordinary) is most properly called *superstition.* And in that sense I conceive it is, that in some *authentic writings of our Church,* the *idolatry and superstition of the Papists* is censured; by *idolatry* meaning the worship of images among them, and by *superstition* the worship and prayers to saints departed." * And of " the images either of God, or Christ, or angels, or saints," he says, that " to pray to, or to bestow any act of divine worship on any such image in any respect," " what is that but idolatry?" Adding, " I say, in any respect, and I mean with any distinction of *mediante imagine,* or *relativè,* &c. For 1. it is an unreasonable thing for them to whom the Law is given, to make a distinction by which it may in some sense be lawful not to keep it; such distinctions must be made by the Lawgiver, or else they are not safe. 2. Although it be to God also *mediante imagine,* i. e. first fastening my act of worship upon the image, as the next or immediate object, and then mediately on God, this is clearly to worship the image, though not the image alone, and that must be image-worship; or (2) Though it be only *relativè,* to the image in relation to God, whose image it is, this is again worshipping that image, though not that image only, and that will not rescue the worshipping of an image from the censure of image-worship, any more than the affirming faith to justify *instrumentaliter relativè,* is not the affirming it to justify. As for the difference betwixt *image-worship* and *idolatry,* or *idol-worship,* if any such be pretended from the difference between *imago* and *idolum,* it will not be worth our pains to examine it, because the worshipping of anything, which is not God, be it image or idol, Christian or heathen similitude, or anything else, will fall under the guilt which now we speak of [i. e. idolatry]." † " Once more, to worship the bread in the Sacrament, must (wheresoever it is to be met with) cer-

* Of superstition. Sect. 3. Works, vol. i. p. 242. ed. 1684.

† Of idolatry. Sect. 56, 57. Ib. pp. 262, 3.

tainly be idolatry too, in the literal notion of the word, i. e. the worshipping that which is not God. And for those that do this on any the subtilest ground, that by any error or mistake (be it never so piously taken up) do actually worship this bread, that first conceive it to be turned into the very body of Christ, and the elements after consecration to be no longer bread and wine, but very Christ incarnate, and thereupon do worship it: these I say, in case they be mistaken, and those elements be not so turned and transubstantiated into Christ, though they are not guilty of the sin of idolatry in all the aggravations that belonged to it among the heathen, ... yet can I not free them from the charge of worshipping an idol, i, e. somewhat which is not God, viz. a piece of *consecrated bread*, &c. He that conceives this too sudden or severe a censure, may know that the Papist doctors are very ready to make confession of it themselves. *If the elements be not so changed*, saith Costerus of Transubstantiation, *we Papists are the meanest, vilest kind of idolaters in the world, worse* (as I remember he adds) *than the Laplanders that worshipped a red cloth.*" * See also his Treatises against the Romanists in the 2nd vol. of his Works.

BISHOP MORLEY.

After noticing the various unauthorised doctrines of the Romish Church, as, Invocation of angels and saints, Adoration of images, Purgatory, Indulgences, &c. &c., he adds,—"Whereunto might be added the doctrine of Transubstantiation, with all the absurd and blasphemous consequences of it, especially *the idolatrous adoration* of the consecrated elements of bread and wine." † And in his Letter to Janus Ulitius on the Invocation of saints, he repeatedly lays it down that such a practice is *idolatrous*, ‡ and contumelious towards God or Christ, or both; § and that the distinction which the Romanists draw

* Ib. Sect. 64, 65. p. 263.

† Bishop of Winton's Letter in answer to the Roman priest. p. 34. In his "Several Treatises." Lond. 1683. 4to.

‡ Ad Janum Ulitium Epist. duas; pp. 20, 25, 26, 28, 33. Ib.

§ Ib. p. 20.

between the Invocations they address to God, and those which they address to the saints, is frivolous and worthless (inò nullam);* and that the work of intercession so belongs to Christ, that it cannot be given to any creature "without the highest sacrilege and most manifest idolatry." † And in his "Letter to the Duchess of York," he thus speaks on the whole subject; —"Although we have so much charity for some that live and die in the belief and practice of some erroneous doctrines, and of some superstitious usances of the Church of Rome; supposing they do both the one and the other out of invincible ignorance, and supposing too, that they would have continued in neither, if they had known or suspected them to be either *erroneous* or *superstitious*, and consequently, that they had a preparation of mind to believe and practise the contrary truths, if they had been made known unto them, or rather, if they had not by their false teachers been concealed from them; and lastly, supposing likewise that as they do actually and particularly repent of all their known sins, so they do habitually, or in the general, truly and heartily repent before they die of all their unknown sins also; or of all such sins of theirs which God knows to be sins, though they do not; and consequently of all such *errors* and *superstitions* as they have ignorantly and unwittingly and unwillingly lived in: although (I say) we have so much charity for some that have been born and lived and died in the communion of the Church of Rome as not to deny, *upon the aforesaid suppositions*, they may be saved; not BECAUSE but NOTWITHSTANDING they lived and died in that Church, which is no more than the charity which upon the same supposition they have for us, or for those that live and die in our Church: *yet we have not, nor cannot have, the same hope for those that having been born and bred in our Church, and sufficiently instructed in the doctrine of it, do afterwards become apostates from it, and proselytes to the Church of Rome, by renouncing those truths they were taught in the one, and professing those falsities they are made to believe in the*

* Ib. p. 21. † Ib. p. 25

other: for whom (as I said) we have no such hope, *nor indeed any hope at all,* unless they do actually and particularly repent of this, as well as of all other their known sins, and withal do testify the truth of that repentance, by returning again unto us, and by asking God and the Church forgiveness for the sin against the one, and for their scandal against the other, by their going away from us, if at least they have time and opportunity to do it. Now this (according to our opinion) being the difference betwixt those that after the knowledge and profession of the truth, go out from us, and those that would (if they had known the truth) have come over to us, it is manifest, that the charity we have for the one, though they live and die in the Church of Rome, can be no motive or encouragement for those of the other sort to go and live and die there; no more than it can be any warrant for a sound man to go out of an healthy air and to put himself in a *pest-house,* because there is a possibility that some one or a few may not die of the plague there." *

BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

This eminent prelate, in his last work, "A Dissuasive from Popery," observes,—"Their worshipping of images we have already reproved upon the account of its novelty and innovation in Christian religion. But that it is against good life, *a direct breach of the second Commandment,* an act of *idolatry, as much as the heathens themselves were guilty of,* in relation to the second Commandment, is but too evident by the doctrines of their own leaders. For if to give divine honour to a creature be idolatry, then the doctors of the Church of Rome teach their people to commit idolatry. . . . . Neither can this be eluded by saying, that though the same worship be given to the image of Christ, as to Christ himself, yet it is not

* Letter written by the Bishop of Winchester to Her Highness the Duchess of York, some few months before her death; pp. 15—17. In "Several Treatises," &c.

done in the same way; for it is *terminatively* to Christ or God, but *relatively* to the image, that is, to the image for God's or Christ's sake. For this is that we complain of . . . . it is of itself evident, that whoever, Christian or heathen, worships the image of anything, cannot possibly worship that image *terminatively*, for the very being of an image is *relative;* and therefore if the man understands but common sense, he must suppose and intend that worship to be *relative*, and a heathen could not worship an image with any other worship; and the second Commandment, forbidding to worship *the likeness of anything in heaven and earth*, does only forbid that thing which is in heaven to be worshipped by an image, that is, it forbids only a relative worship . . . . And therefore these doctors teach the same thing which they condemn in the heathen. . . . . Either therefore the heathens were not idolaters in the worshipping of an image, or else these men are. The heathens did indeed infinitely more violate the first Commandment; but against the second, precisely and separately from the first, *the transgression is alike.* The same also is the case in their worshipping the consecrated Bread and Wine. Of which how far they will be excused before God by their ignorant pretensions and suppositions, we know not; but they hope to save themselves harmless by saying, that they believe the Bread to be their Saviour, and that if they did not believe so, they would not do so. We believe that they say true; but *we are afraid that this will no more excuse them, than it will excuse those who worship the Sun and Moon, and the Queen of heaven, whom they would not worship, if they did not believe* [*them*] *to have Divinity in them.*"* "The religion of a Christian consists in faith and hope, repentance and charity, Divine worship and celebration of the Sacraments, and finally in keeping the Commandments of God. Now in all these, both in doctrines and practices, the Church of Rome does dangerously err, and teaches men so to do."†

* Dissuasive from Popery. Pt. 1. ch. 2. sect. 12. ed. Lond. 1686. 8vo. pp. 196—200.

† Ib. Sect. 13. pp. 202, 3.

BISHOP PATRICK.

The works of this able and excellent prelate against the doctrines of the Church of Rome are so well known, that it seems needless to do more than refer to them. And in his "Answer to the Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel," * he expressly maintains,† that the ruling power at that time in the Roman Church was Antichrist; which, he says, is "the common opinion of all Protestants;"‡ and that Rome Christian, as then existing, was pointed out in the Prophecies of Scripture, as "a people apostatized from true religion to *idolatry;*" § and quotes with approbation Dr. Jackson's remark, "That he who will not acknowledge the Papacy to be the kingdom of Antichrist, hath great reason to suspect his heart, that if he had lived with our Saviour, he would scarce have taken him for his Messias." (On the Creed, bk. 3, ch. 22.) ‖

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.

From the writings of this learned prelate volumes might be quoted on our present subject. It is only necessary, however, here to refer to his Treatise, entitled, "A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, and the hazard of salvation in the communion of it," &c.;¶ with the Defences of it afterwards published.** The great object of this Treatise is, to shew that the Church of Rome is guilty of idolatry in the worship of images, the invocation of saints, and the adoration of the host. "*Upon the very same principles,*" he says, "*that a Papist worships images, saints, and the host, he may as lawfully worship the earth, the stars, or*

* An Answer to a Book spread abroad by the Romish Priests, intituled, The Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel. Lond. 1692. 12mo.

† P. 88. ‡ P. 86. § P. 88. ‖ Pp. 94, 5.

¶ Third ed. Lond. 1672. 8vo.

** An Answer to several late Treatises occasioned by a Book entitled, A Discourse, &c. First Part. Second ed. Lond. 1674. 8vo. Also, Defence of the Discourse, &c. Lond. 1676. 8vo. Also, Several Conferences between a Romish Priest, a fanatic Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England, concerning the idolatry of the Church of Rome. Lond. 1679. 8vo.

men ; and be no more guilty of idolatry in one, than in the other of them." * And in the Prefaces to this "Discourse" and the "Answer to several treatises" in defence of it, he proves at large, that this is *the doctrine of the Church of England.*

ARCHDEACON DAUBENY.

That I may continue this chain of evidence to the present time, I will close the list with Archdeacon Daubeny. In his "Protestant's Companion," we find the following remarks. "Should there be any doubt with respect to the real sentiments of our Reformers, relative to those corruptions, against which the Article in question [the xxiid] was designed to guard, the Homilies, which were intended as enlarged comments upon the Articles, on those parts of them particularly, which are directed expressly against the gross corruptions of the Romish Church, are calculated to do it away. Of these, however, Mr. B. cannot speak with any tolerable patience. . . . What we look for in our Homilies is truth and sound doctrine. And the reason why our Homilies give so much offence to Mr. B. is, because they speak too much truth, and in a plain way. . . . The Homily here more immediately referred to, gives, in some detail, the disgraceful history of the rise and progress of idolatry in the Christian Church. It cannot, therefore, be a matter of surprise, that a priest of *an idolatrous Church*, regarding such a history as a sort of *scandalum magnatum*, or an unpardonable offence against the assumed majesty of the Popedom, should cry aloud. Mr. B., from the regard which he would be thought occasionally to feel, for the characters of the present clergy of the Established Church, 'is very sure that the generality of them are much too liberal, as well as too delicate minded, to admit the doctrines or utter the language of our Homilies.' Should this be intended as a compliment to the clergy of the Church of England, it is, I apprehend, one by which they will not feel themselves to be much

* Discourse, &c. p. 113.

flattered. For I trust the time will never come, when the clergy of the Church of England will cease to 'endure sound doctrine,' although it may not be clothed in the polished dress of the 19th century. . . . Now having travelled through the whole extent of the Popish countries from the northern to the southern extremity . . . . the language of our Reformers does not, to me, appear to be one bit too strong for the subject to which it is applied: on the contrary, that they were fully justified in contrasting the tawdry frippery of *an idolatrous Church* so ostentatiously displayed on all occasions, with the 'sincere simplicity of the true Church of God, as a chaste matron, espoused, as the Scripture teacheth, to one husband, our Saviour Jesus Christ.'" * "My attention is professedly directed to the *Church of Rome*, as a corrupt branch of the Universal Church of Christ; whilst *the position which I undertake to establish is, that the Church of Rome is, at this time, an idolatrous and grossly corrupted Church.* And that my reader may be competent to judge, how far I make good my point, I shall set out with giving a definition of what is to be understood by *idolatry*, in the words of Archbishop Wake. 'That to give any appropriate acts of divine worship to any creature, whatever sense men have of the thing to which they give them, or their *intention* be in so doing, is nevertheless esteemed by God to be idolatry.' . . . *I say openly, boldly, and honestly, without any qualification whatever, that if the crime of idolatry ever has been committed in the world, it is at this time committed by the Church of Rome.*" The image worship in the Church of Rome, he says, "is in one most important respect precisely similar to that which was practised in the times of heathenism; since the heathens defended their idolatry by the same pretence which is used by the Papist of the present day, namely, that the worship was *relative*."†

The reader who is at all acquainted with our ecclesiastical

* The Protestant's Companion, or, a seasonable preservative against the errors, corruptions, and unfounded claims of a superstitious and idolatrous Church. Lond. 1821. 8vo. pp. 118—21.

† Ib. p. 132, 3.

history, will at once see, that the divines from whom these extracts are given, are exclusively such as cannot be excepted against by any party as likely to take (what is called) an ultra-protestant view of the subject. And I need hardly add, that such extracts give, in themselves, but a very inadequate idea of the force of the evidence that exists upon the subject, even in the writings of those from whom the quotations are made; and that the only difficulty in forming such a Catena is, to compress it within any reasonable limits.*

When we review, then, the witness thus borne by our Church and her divines for three centuries, against the errors, superstitions, and idolatries of the Church of Rome, how painful the thought that those very errors, superstitions, and idolatries are again finding advocates among us, even among those who, on the faith of subscription to our standards of doctrine and worship, minister in our Church! There is a remark of Mr. Oakeley himself, to which I may, I trust, without offence, call attention, as one which deserves the serious consideration, not merely of some among us, but of all of us; for the circumstances of the present times are such as to bring responsibility in this matter, more or less, upon all. "If," he says, "by 'Popery' be meant some form of superstition and idolatry, then not they only who seek to *advance*, but they also who do not *actively resist*, the present movement, (being supposed conscientious men,) must be understood to intimate, by the very fact of such advocacy, *or acquiescence*, their belief that it tends to no such result, except in the way of perversion or abuse." (pp 57, 8.) To what "result," however, "the present movement" leads, is now no longer a matter of doubt.

I cannot conclude without remarking, how strikingly, (as it appears to me,) even in the present unhappy controversy, is seen the value of our standards of doctrine and worship. True, they have been made to speak any language which the Tracta-

* There is an excellent work by Bishop Bull, entitled, "The corruptions of the Church of Rome, &c. in answer to the Bishop of Meaux's queries;" lately reprinted with additional notes by the Christian Knowledge Society, in a Tract for general distribution.

rians might desire; and hence those who oppose subscription to such tests, have availed themselves of the fact, (as the Roman Catholics do of the various misinterpretations given to the Holy Scriptures,) as proving that such documents are like a leaden sword or a nose of wax, which can be turned in any direction. But the very attempt to turn them out of the direction which the common sense of mankind sees that they were intended to have, involving, as it necessarily must, the practice of evasion, equivocation, and misrepresentation, to a fearful extent, disgusts men of honest and ingenuous minds, and consequently renders its authors, with all such persons, powerless. Views so recommended carry, in the case of many, their own antidote with them. Their misinterpretations may be very ingenious, and very plausible; but, after all, the stubborn statements against which they are directed remain unscathed, in all the majesty of truth; bearing their quiet but decisive witness against all who have misrepresented them. The more the matter is inquired into, the more will the public mind perceive the disingenuousness and Jesuitism that have characterized the Tractarian movement. There is great hope, humanly speaking, in this fact. An honest straightforward attempt to recommend to public favour the doctrines of the Church of Rome, however unpromising it might have been at first, (and we trust little likely to be under any circumstances successful,) would still have been more likely to produce a permanent effect, than an endeavour to make the standards of our Protestant Church speak the language of Romanism. To subscribe Protestant Articles of faith, and take office and emolument in a Church on the faith of that subscription, while holding Roman doctrine; and justify it on the ground, that the words of those Articles can be twisted and tortured so as not to condemn the doctrine which common sense tells mankind they were intended to condemn; is an act subversive even of the bonds by which society is held together. And men cannot but feel, that they who are sapping the very foundations of morality, are not likely to be the best teachers of religion.

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
geles
ate stamped below.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 702 530 7

BX 5099 G61t
Goode - Tract XC. historically refuted

BX
5099
G61t

Bonni soit qui mal y pense